The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

Vol. XLVI · October 1960 · No. 3

Presidential Campaign 1960: A Symposium (Part I)

Pre-Convention Speaking

Preface	*Paul H. Boase*	239
Hubert H. Humphrey	*Ernest G. Bormann*	240
Lyndon B. Johnson	*Harold Weiss* and *Haddon Robinson*	241
John F. Kennedy	*Harry P. Kerr*	241
Wayne L. Morse	*Herman Cohen*	242
Adlai E. Stevenson	*Raymond Yeager*	243
Stuart Symington	*Robert P. Friedman*	244
Richard M. Nixon and Nelson A. Rockefeller	*Frederick G. Alexander*	245

Convention Speaking

Preface	*Robert C. Jeffrey*	246
Democratic Convention	*Malcolm O. Sillars*	247
Republican Convention	*Russel Windes*	249

Love in Several Masques: Notes on the New York Theatre 1959-1960	*Alan S. Downer*	253
The North American Service of Radio Moscow	*William S. Howell*	262
Persuasion and the Concepts of Identification	*Dennis G. Day*	270
An Experimental Study of the Effects of Evaluation Upon Group Behavior	*Alvin Goldberg*	274
Ghostwriting and the Rhetorical Critic	*Ernest G. Bormann*	284
Logan's Oration—How Authentic?	*Ray H. Sandefur*	289
Milton's Rhetorical Exercises	*Donald Lemen Clark*	297
A Problem of Assimilation	*Ray Irwin*	302

The Forum 304

Official Communications from the Executive Secretary 304
Election of Officers 304
Amendment to the Constitution 304
New SAA Address 305

Corrigenda 305

Enthymeme Revisited *Wayne N. Thompson* 305

Forensic Therapy *Franklin H. Silverman* 305

Choral Speaking *Clive Sansom* 306

Invitation 307

New Books in Review *Robert G. Gunderson* 308

Auditus . . . *John W. Black* 308

Natural Language for Deaf Children *Vincent H. Knauf* 313

The Case for Basic Education *Thorrel B. Fest* 314

The First Modern Comedies *Kalmin A. Burnim* 314

Bernard Shaw and the Nineteenth Century Tradition *David Wiley* 315

Edwin Forrest *Jonathan Curvin* 316

The Art of Ruth Draper *Albert T. Martin* 317

The Neighborhood Playhouse *and* Community Theatre *Joseph G. Green* 317

The Best Plays of 1958-1959 *and* Theatre World: Season 1958-1959 *and* Theatre World Annual (London) *and* The Theatre Annual, 1959 *Eugene K. Bristow* 318

Mark Twain Tonight! *and* Mark Twain and Southwestern Humor *Loren Reid* 319

The Early Lectures of Ralph Waldo Emerson *Harry P. Kerr* 320

The Speeches of Charles Dickens *Melvin H. Miller* 320

Mark Twain-Howells Letters *Herbert Feinstein* 321

Their Brothers' Keepers: Moral Stewardship in the United States, 1800-1865 *David Lindsey* 322

Republican Ascendancy, 1921-1933 *John F. Wilson* 323

The Politics of National Party Conventions *Robert C. Jeffrey* 323

The 1956 Presidential Campaign *Raymond Yeager* 324

The Communist Persuasion *Robert T. Oliver* 325

The Process of Communication *Dwight L. Freshley* 325

The Idea of Freedom *Paul Carmack* 326

Briefly Noted 327

Books Received 333

Shop Talk *Robert L. Scott* 335

The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XLVI · OCTOBER 1960 · NUMBER 3

PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN 1960: A SYMPOSIUM PART I

CONTEST FOR THE NOMINATION

INTRODUCTION

THIS *QJS* quadrennial symposium on the presidential election is divided into two parts. Part I, "Contest for the Nomination," in this issue, covers aspects of pre-convention operations and the convention itself. Part II, "Contest for the Presidency," will cover the post-convention campaign and will be published in the December issue.

This detailed coverage is made possible through the courtesy of the SAA Subcommittee on Contemporary Public Address, which has made a project study of the campaign. The committee will issue in December a detailed mimeographed report of its 1960 presidential campaign studies. Copies may be procured from Paul H. Boase, Oberlin College.

Mr. Bormann is Assistant Professor of Speech, University of Minnesota; Mr. Weiss is Professor of Speech, Southern Methodist University, and Mr. Robinson is Professor of Homiletics, Dallas Theological Seminary; Mr. Kerr is Lecturer in Public Speaking, Harvard University; Mr. Cohen is Associate Professor of Speech, University of Oregon; Mr. Yeager is Assistant Professor of Speech, Bowling Green State University; Mr. Friedman is Assistant Professor of Speech, University of Missouri.

Mr. Sillars is Associate Professor of Speech, San Fernando Valley State College; Mr. Windes is Associate Professor of Speech, San Francisco State College.

Papers for "Pre-convention Speaking" were arranged for and edited by Paul H. Boase, Associate Professor of Speech, Oberlin College; he has written the preface for the section. Papers for "Convention Speaking" were handled by Robert C. Jeffrey, Assistant Professor of Speech, Indiana University, who has written the preface to that section.

PRE-CONVENTION SPEAKING

PREFACE

Paul H. Boase

As the six Democratic and the two Republican potential nominees neared the finish line, two gave up, and the rest continued in various states of confidence, hope, and frustration. The preferential primaries, the Senate floor, the electronic media, and the town square provided the course for the pre-convention rhetorical race of 1960. This report differs from previous presidential election symposia carried by *QJS* in concentrating on preliminary phases and by giving abbreviated treatment of a larger number of speakers.

The critics selected for the pre-convention speaking were either living in the regions of the candidates, or had

previously studied the areas. They were asked to make an accurate, on-the-spot analysis. These short essays covering the speaking of eight candidates can at best merely capsule the distinctive rhetorical flavor of each candidate, and offer only a glimpse of the many-pronged techniques displayed.

DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATES

1.

Hubert H. Humphrey

Ernest G. Bormann

The climax of Senator Humphrey's year-long campaign for the Presidency came in the Wisconsin and West Virginia primaries. His campaign speeches contained three main elements: (1) the Humphrey program, (2) an attack on the Republicans, and (3) an attack on Senator Kennedy.

He advocated "government with a heart," "food for peace," and a "1960 bill of rights for the American people." The last included more adequate social security, a greatly expanded housing program, a "fair and equitable" tax program, a "fair break" for labor, federal aid to education, a $1.25 minimum wage, full civil rights, a revised farm program, a drive against inflation, and the protection of small independent business. In foreign affairs he was for "works of peace," the "Great White Fleet" plan, the UN, the World Court, and controlled disarmament.

His program, couched in slogans, made a strong appeal to desires for peace, security, money, and civil rights. His speeches suggested that he was an experienced administrator, as demonstrated in Minneapolis; an able legislator, as demonstrated in Washington; a tough adversary for Khrushchev, as demonstrated in Moscow; and above all, that he was a "liberal."

In Wisconsin he castigated the Benson farm program. Predicting that Nixon would deny any relationship to that program, he promised to give the Vice President a blood test and eat his hat if Nixon did not turn out to be the father.

By February, Humphrey was attacking Kennedy's voting record. Kennedy had voted wrong twenty-seven times on farm legislation. He had voted wrong on housing, on REA, on Social Security. Humphrey attacked Kennedy's voting record because he wanted to prove there were issues that divided them. After flying into LaCrosse in a small plane, Humphrey said, "I look at that big 352 (Kennedy's plane) and I feel like I'm standing here with a little old slingshot."[1]

As the race tightened in West Virginia, the attack on Kennedy lost its leaven of humor. Humphrey still played his major themes—adapting his program to West Virginia by emphasizing the problems of economically depressed areas—but in May, the *New York Times* reported the campaign became "a name-calling contest."[2] Humphrey charged "political payola," accused Kennedy of spending $250,000 in West Virginia, and said he was soft on Nixon.

Humphrey's reliance on slogans and assertions to develop his program reflects the breadth and complexity of the program, and the time limitations of campaign speaking.

Defeated decisively in West Virginia, Humphrey quit the race, but many of his ideas are in the Democratic platform.

[1] *The Minneapolis Star*, March 25, 1960, p. 328.

[2] *The New York Times*, May 1, 1960, p. 54.

2.

Lyndon B. Johnson

Harold Weiss and Haddon Robinson

It is possible to argue that Lyndon Baines Johnson did not seek the Democratic nomination, and in the same way argue that a mousetrap does not seek the mouse. The senator from Texas did not openly admit his candidacy until time for the Convention. He feared that an announcement would hinder his effectiveness as the puissant majority leader of the U. S. Senate. Since Johnson had no intention of battling in the primaries, declaration would do his campaign no good. Then too, losing might be less galling if he never openly sought the honor. Yet Johnson, a superb political strategist, waged a powerful, low-gear effort for the nomination. While others, like his old political ally, Speaker Sam Rayburn, opened campaign offices for him throughout the country, Johnson stayed at his post in the Senate, and maintained the image of the steadfast statesman.

This strategy prevented Johnson from making many significant political addresses. He traveled when he could to meet the delegates, but his speeches were designed to help his public image. Johnson preached middle-of-the-road politics. To a Chicago group early in the campaign he declared, "Partisanship is no substitute for purpose."[3] To groups that were not decidedly Democratic he affirmed, "In all that I do, I am by my own personal choice, a free man first, then an American, a United States Senator, and a Democrat—in that order."[4]

Johnson did everything but move the Rockies to Dallas to overcome his Southern origin and to prove that he was really a Westerner. With the touch of Texana in his voice, he discussed "our problems" with audiences throughout the West. When the Democratic chairman, Paul Butler, stated that a man from the South would not be the Democratic nominee, Johnson replied, "The Democratic party is too big to discriminate against men who have the Western spirit."[5] He agreed, too, that it was wrong to vote against a candidate's religion, and added that it was equally wrong to vote against a candidate's place of birth.[6]

Johnson suited his topics to his audience. In New York City, he discussed the Civil Rights bill that he pushed through the Senate. In Texas and in the South, however, he talked about "the need for vigor" and the race for outer space.

As the convention drew near and other candidates were eliminated in the primaries, Senator John Kennedy recognized that Lyndon Johnson was his closest rival. Johnson enthusiasts claimed that delegates from the South and the border states would give their reluctant candidate over five hundred votes on the early ballots.[7] Lyndon Johnson had already demonstrated his ability for putting votes together in the Senate. His followers went to Los Angeles with the hope that if he could do it on a national scale, they could do as their campaign slogan suggested and "Go all the way with L. B. J."

3.

John F. Kennedy

Harry P. Kerr

Jack slew the giants with an adroit combination of psychological warfare and pitched battle, neatly blended with

[3] January 21, 1960 press release from Senator Johnson's office.

[4] Quoted in Lyndon B. Johnson for President *Newsletter*, Austin, Texas.

[5] *Dallas Morning News*, April 24, 1960, p. 11.

[6] Address at Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner, Salt Lake City, April 23, 1960. *Dallas Morning News*, *loc. cit.*

[7] *Time*, LXXV (June 13, 1960), 25.

just the requisite amount of good fortune. It was shrewd psychology, for example, to ignore the Catholic issue while benefiting (as he unquestionably did) from his religious kinship with nearly one-third of Wisconsin's voters. It was perilous but essential to meet this question head-on in West Virginia, however, and he responded with a vigorous attack that buried the religious issue (alive, it should be noted, and capable of being exhumed), swept Humphrey out of contention, and gave the Kennedy bandwagon an irresistible forward impetus. At the same time, it was Irish luck that the Badger primary preceded West Virginia's because Kennedy was able to wear down Humphrey's relatively shallow organization in Wisconsin. With a greater prize at stake in West Virginia, Humphrey no longer had sufficient money, people, or stamina to capitalize on the possibilities offered by his labor record and Kennedy's religion.

A dozen illustrations could be adduced to support the point that Kennedy succeeded in following the long primary road to Los Angeles without once missing a turn or running out of gas because he planned wisely, executed brilliantly, and carried a four leaf clover. The outstanding quality was execution. Time after time he converted challenges into triumphs.

In winning seven primary elections, Kennedy spoke often and well. From January to June, he delivered a dozen major addresses before Congress and groups like the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and several hundred, five-minute stump speeches. In each speech he discussed a single subject, chosen with an eye to audience interests. Oregon lumbermen listened to Kennedy's plans for increased housing construction; Wisconsin dairy farmers heard him promise to raise milk prices; party workers attended thoughtful discussions of the qualities needed in the next president. Organization followed a simple format: analysis of the problem and enumeration of proposed solutions. Illustrations stemmed almost exclusively from history. In six months he cited or quoted at least twenty American presidents and treated Gibbon and the *Cambridge Modern History* like old friends. Simple, precise language suggested competence but not superiority. The speeches were long on facts, short on humor, almost devoid of figures and tropes, and sparing of all but the most restrained emotional appeals.

If Kennedy lacked eloquence, he avoided partisan platitudes. Listeners found him serious, forthright, restrained but forceful. Reporters overworked adjectives like detached, efficient, and bold. Opponents said he was too wealthy and too inexperienced, but many voters thought he sounded more like a leader than a campaigner.

4.

Wayne L. Morse

Herman Cohen

Wayne L. Morse's campaign for the Democratic presidential nomination can be viewed in retrospect as a campaign of frustration, disillusion, misjudgment, and confusion. The campaign was rhetorically vigorous, colorful, and courageous, but it failed to convince the voters. The failure may have reduced Senator Morse's strength nationally and in his own state.

One of the disturbing characteristics of Morse's campaigning is that the more obvious rhetorical techniques were apparently well utilized. Morse's speeches were distinguished by their lucidity, cogency of argument, clear and vivid use

of language, structural unity, and forceful, even eloquent, delivery. The rhetorical critic must therefore attempt to explain Morse's defeat by searching for causes not immediately apparent in his rhetoric.

It may be that Wayne Morse gravely overestimated his national standing. It would seem that Morse's stature as a Senator was less transferable than John Kennedy's or even Hubert Humphrey's. Morse himself probably contributed to his own difficulties by not defining his role very clearly in his speeches. At times he referred to himself as a serious candidate with 100 or more potential votes. At other times he considered himself Oregon's favorite son. Senator Kennedy was able to exploit Morse's ambivalence by praising Morse's senatorial abilities but depreciating his presidential ambitions.

If Morse failed to create the proper image of himself, he was also unsuccessful in creating an unfavorable image of Senator Kennedy. Perhaps his listeners were unwilling to accept the portrait of Kennedy drawn by Morse, which bore no resemblance to the picture already painted by the Kennedy organization and campaigns. Morse's references to Kennedy's "reactionary voting record" and his description of Kennedy as "the millionaire carpet bagger from Massachusetts" may have caused some confusion about the Kennedy image, but were probably not very persuasive.[8]

The inability of Morse to carry Oregon, his home state, might be a subject of extensive inquiry. It might be suggested that by the May 20 election the Kennedy band wagon could not be halted, even on Morse's home ground. Oregon's vote eliminated Wayne L. Morse from consideration as a favorite son candidate.

[8] *Eugene Register Guard*, May 12, 1960, p. 1.

5.

Adlai E. Stevenson

Raymond Yeager

Although an "inactive" presidential candidate—one who would run only if proferred another draft—Adlai Stevenson nevertheless managed to keep himself in the limelight. Early in the year, he toured twelve Latin-American nations without one stone cast at him. Returning to the United States, he published a book[9] which contained some of his recent speeches and articles. He wrote for *This Week* Sunday supplement two articles outlining plans for radio-TV debates between presidential candidates.[10]

In April, Stevenson embarked on a series of speeches. But it was his statement concerning the ill-fated U-2 flight that brought him the greatest publicity. As the first top-ranking Democrat to issue a sharp criticism of the Administration's handling of the "summit" crisis, Stevenson hit President Eisenhower where it hurt, just as he used to "tag" Secretary of State Dulles when the latter was "off-base" on Formosa, Quemoy, Indo-China, and Suez. Stevenson said that the U-2 flight gave Khrushchev the "crowbar and sledge hammer" to wreck the conference. At a Cook County Democratic dinner in Chicago, he charged that the Administration "helped make successful negotiations with the Russians—negotiations that are vital to our survival—impossible so long as they are in power."[11]

Ever mindful of his role as a statesman, however, Stevenson proposed on

[9] *Putting First Things First: A Democratic View* (New York, 1960).

[10] Adlai E. Stevenson, "Choice by Hullabaloo," *This Week* (February 28, 1960), pp. 8-9, 11-12, 15. "Plan for a Great Debate," *ibid.* (March 6, 1960), pp. 14-15.

[11] *U. S. News and World Report*, XLVIII (May 30, 1960), 81.

June 1 a five point "grand strategy for peace." He called for (1) a defense build-up "that does not depend on the budget bureaucrats;" (2) establishment of a new Atlantic Council to strengthen the Western Alliance; (3) a long range program of aid to underdeveloped countries; (4) greater stress on complete controlled disarmament as "an imperative;" and (5) more spending for schools, health, research, and housing.[12]

At Waukegan, Illinois, in June, Stevenson asked both parties' candidates to pledge themselves to keep Khrushchev out of the election campaign:

> Let us attack each other's mistakes, but let us never attack each other's motives. Let the argument be conducted in a manner worthy of free men. . . . We must keep in mind that our chief problem is still how to deal with the Russians and the Chinese. It is not a matter of who is soft and who is hard, but of who is wise and who is stupid.[13]

In his pre-convention speaking, Stevenson occasionally sounded like a candidate. But more often his speeches, still superior to those of the other contenders, kept him in consideration for appointment as Secretary of State if another Democrat won the presidency.

6.

Stuart Symington

Robert P. Friedman

By March 24, 1960, when Stuart Symington officially announced his candidacy for the Democratic Presidential nomination, he had been running hard for six months. Between September, when the Senate adjourned, and the end of 1959 he spoke in 22 states and made a campaign-minded trip abroad. During 1960, before the convention met in July, he made almost 100 formal speeches in 27 states, held numerous press conferences, appeared on all the "right" television programs, and shook a multitude of hands. Always he spoke competently, frequently he spoke well, and occasionally he made distinguished speeches.

Implicit in his speeches is his entire campaign strategy; but as important as what he said and where, is what he did not say and where he did not speak. He spoke frequently and with authority on national defense, but he spoke as often on farm problems, lack of economic growth, failure of executive leadership, administrative waste, and the entire range of national social problems. Throughout the country, and always, he attacked the Republican administration.

Rarely did Symington detail his own program and never did he compare his ideas with those of his fellow candidates. Never did he express disapproval of them or state a preference among them. And, significantly, though he spoke in states where primaries were held, he never spoke as a candidate in primary elections.

Symington's campaign strategy and his rhetoric were consistent; his was an effort to make himself "Everybody's No. 2."[14] The strategy had weaknesses. Symington could not make positive statements of his program and so escape the stereotype of being a one-issue man unless he entered primaries, where headlines were made; he could not enter primaries without revealing his differences with other Democratic candidates.

However, the strategy also had strength. He gave no positive cause for disaffection among Democrats; he drew no serious fire from fellow candidates;

[12] *The New York Times*, June 2, 1960, Sec. 1, p. 1.

[13] AP release, June 24, 1960.

[14] *Time*, LXXIV (November 9, 1959), 18.

and he could sit back, but not far back, and wait for other hopefuls to destroy each other.

It was not bad strategy. He could not have debated successfully against Humphrey; he lacked the political skill of Kennedy; and he had no solid sectional backing to rival Johnson's. But he was not too liberal; neither was he Catholic or too young; nor was he plagued by a southern affinity. One of his assets was that he had fewer liabilities than any of his rivals.

Symington's campaign materials described him as "The logical choice of the North, East, South, and West," and when the campaign placards were printed, the dominent word was "Unity." Symington designed his speeches and his campaign strategy with the hope of becoming the brightest dark horse, or as someone said, the second Missouri Compromise.

REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES

Richard M. Nixon and Nelson A. Rockefeller

Frederick G. Alexander

Vice President Nixon was the heir apparent to the Republican nomination for the presidency, and so there was little need to campaign directly. He was challenged briefly by Rockefeller, who formally withdrew, but continued to act, in many ways, like a candidate. Few official candidates have ever appealed so strongly for popular support. As one has trouble telling who the players are without a program, so it was difficult to determine the Republican candidates by mere observation. The in-again, out-again technique of Mr. Rockefeller was not without explanation. He had found in a series of campaign-type excursions prior to December that outside his own state, party support was meager. He realized therefore that he would have to sacrifice too much time from the governorship if he were to campaign seriously for the presidency. Nevertheless, it was only a few months later that Rockefeller shook the entire Republican party structure by criticising party leadership and, more specifically, Nixon's silence on important issues. The sensitive Republican press was quick to respond; some editors went so far as to accuse Rockefeller of party treason. Nixon himself snapped back quickly with an offer to face Rockefeller publicly on any issues he would choose. The anticipated "great debate" never materialized, because the challenger backed down, complaining that one could not debate an opponent who said nothing.

Some observers believe Rockefeller had aims other than getting involved in a debate with Mr. Nixon, whose prowess in this field is well-known.[15] Rockefeller had been a close viewer of administration difficulties in the areas of defense, economic development, and health, education and welfare. An opportunity to call national attention to our shortcomings was difficult to resist. Furthermore, the Republicans needed some newsworthy excitement to recapture the nation's attention. The Democrats could argue about their candidates' respective ages, religions, and wealth, but in the Republican camp an almost total blackout of headlines existed until the Rockefeller challenge. Without the little suspense caused by

[15] See Earl Mazo, *Richard Nixon* (New York, 1959), p. 22.

this flurry, pre-convention maneuvers on the Republican side of the fence would have been dull fare indeed!

Perhaps almost as significant was the frequent comment that Rockefeller's challenge only remotely concerned the 1960 campaign. Should Mr. Nixon fail to achieve the presidency, no one in the country would be in a better position to say "I told you so," than Mr. Rockefeller. Under these conditions the 1964 convention might well consider the gentleman from New York their chief standard bearer.

Even while recognizing the personal motives involved in Rockefeller's challenge, one could not view subsequent statements and speeches by both candidates without feeling that the nation had also benefitted. Two significant issues emerged. One was the question of "growthmanship" as Nixon chose to term it. The other was adequacy of American defense. In the former, Rockefeller forcefully cited the failure of our economy to match strides with Russia, claiming that an expansion of five to six per cent a year is necessary. Nixon chose to defend our present rate of growth, and declared the Russian economy incapable of catching the United States in this century. Their positions on the defense issue were equally divergent; Nixon stood by Eisenhower's assertion that we are adequately prepared now, and Rockefeller claimed that 3.5 billion additional dollars should be expended if we are to be a first class power.

That many of the conflicting views were apparently reconciled in a dramatic convention eve meeting between Rockefeller and Nixon was probably disappointing for those desiring a lengthier discussion, but there emerged some of the key issues in the 1960 presidential campaign. The voters might consider a note of gratitude to the two principal Republican candidates for providing a preliminary view of opposing positions on some of the most important questions of our time.

CONVENTION SPEAKING

Preface

Robert C. Jeffrey

The two major political parties in the United States send representatives every four years to meet in convention for the principal purpose of nominating presidential and vice-presidential candidates to lead their parties in the fall campaign. The glamor and circus atmosphere of the nominating procedures, however, often obscures the more significant aspect of the convention—that of the factional power-struggle for control of the parties.[16] The winners of the struggle are usually rewarded with the selection of their candidate as the party's standard-bearer. This, indeed, was the case in both 1960 conventions.

The oratory which spilled over the speakers rostrum at the Republican convention, held in Chicago, July 25-28, at the International Amphitheater, gave little indication of the power struggle, though subtleties were evident. The speakers, aware of the ever-present radio and television media, were generally careful to establish the image of party solidarity and unity of purpose. The conflict was made more apparent in radio and television interviews and "de-

[16] See Paul T. David, Ralph M. Goldman, and Richard C. Bain, *The Politics of National Party Conventions* (Washington, D. C., 1960).

bates" conducted blocks away from the convention hall itself.

In contrast, the Democrats, meeting in Los Angeles, July 11-15, at the Sports Arena, showed their usual lack of modesty in keeping factional disputes family affairs and exhibited a great amount of disagreement on the convention floor and rostrum.

These distinctive elements of the 1960 national political conventions are made abundantly clear in the reports which follow. The two convention reporters were selected on the basis of their propinquity to the convention sites, and because of their interest and experience as students of political speaking. Both received working press passes and sat in the press section as representatives of the Speech Association of America.

THE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

Malcolm O. Sillars

Even a cursory examination of the speeches at the Democratic National Convention of 1960 reveals that in a rhetorical sense the convention was "rigged." The party of the depression which Harry Truman so dearly loved turned to new times and new issues. A new rhetoric aimed at America's new middle class was fashioned by a group of young leaders who took their ideas from Adlai Stevenson,[17] not Harry Truman. And John F. Kennedy was the heir to the change.

With the exception of the farm problem, the domestic issues chosen by all the speakers concerned urban and suburban problems of the new voter. Even Idaho's Senator Frank Church, convention keynoter, virtually ignored the traditional Democratic issue of public land conservation and use, and Governor McNichols of Colorado, who spoke for the West, emphasized the urban nature of our problems. The restlessness of the uncommitted "third force" in world politics, with its demands for the material comforts which others enjoy, and the status of American science and technology were the international questions most compelling to this new middle class.

The key motivational word was "growth." The older words and phrases which were retained, "progress," "concern," "faith," and the "family sized farm," had new applications. Noticeable by their absence were the negative motivations which had controlled Democratic oratory for over twenty years, "bread lines," "Hoovervilles," and "six cent corn."

Most of the convention speaking was not distinguished. A case in point is keynoter Frank Church. His address had all the essentials of good structure and clear lines of thought, but despite his reputation as a speaker, it lacked impact. "We must seek candid answers to the hard questions! Where do we really stand? Where are we headed? What must we do about it?" This thesis is indicative of reflective oratory which may be in keeping with the new times but does not have the ring of emotive excellence which Alben Barkley gave to a despondent assembly in 1948. (Some evidence dramatized his arguments: "Why this Administration has spent more money on its farm program than all previous Administrations combined, from the time the Department of Agriculture was first established in 1862.") There were places where he did not give his listeners the vital differentiation between the parties: "The communists have seized a third of the world in 15 years! History does

[17] Stevenson recognized in 1952 that the Democrats could no longer run against Hoover, but had to make their case to the new voters in America's new middle class. See my study, "The Presidential Campaign of 1952," *Western Speech* (Spring 1958), pp. 97-99.

not record another conquest so large in so short a time."

Having junked the old appeals and evidence, most convention speakers, unsure of their new audience, failed to find the dramatic evidence and linguistic techniques to strike fire in the political forest of 1960. Students of rhetoric should examine Governor Collins' speech. His fumbling introduction with its impossible joke about the lawyer, the farmer, and the cow, the noise on the floor and the interruption at Mrs. Roosevelt's entry caused most people to overlook his speech, which contained some fine passages. Also worthy of note was national chairman Paul Butler's speech. In one third of his speech he constructed a new ethos for himself as a man of principle, not a fumbler.

A few speeches saved the convention from rhetorical oblivion. Rhetorical critics had better remember Eugene McCarthy's nomination of Adlai Stevenson. It was a masterpiece of audience analysis and dramatic identification. Attempts to form an anti-Kennedy coalition to force a second ballot had failed. Early in his speech, McCarthy touched an open nerve that others had ignored: "And I say—I say to those of you candidates and spokesmen for candidates who say you are confident of the strength that you have at this convention, who say that you are confident and believe in democracy—let this go to a second ballot!" Count one, two, three, and then Lyndon Johnson's Texas delegation, behind which I was seated, was on its feet and screaming along with the other non-Kennedy groups on the floor and in the gallery. Recognizing pay dirt when he saw it, McCarthy hit the theme twice more to a frenzied convention. What followed might have been anti-climactic but it was not.

Sam Rayburn had seen in Lyndon Johnson tested leadership; Governor Blair had said Symington could run well in all sections of the country; Senator Williams had noted that "Townspeople in Phillipsburg . . . could set their clocks by Bob Meyner's arrival at the office each morning at seven"; Orville Freeman had become so involved in telling the convention tnat Hubert Humphrey was still his friend that he had almost forgotten to nominate Jack Kennedy. But Eugene McCarthy hit the one soft spot of Kennedy's nomination push—the "steamroller tactics" which had been charged against the Kennedy camp. Furthermore, an Irish Catholic Senator McCarthy talked about demagoguery and branded the Eisenhower administration with it. He presented an eloquent call for new "unheroic virtues" ("patience, tolerance, forebearance") more in keeping, perhaps, with the new electorate. He appealed to the national and international rather than the sectional America. Packed galleries, yes, but also the first speaker who reached the emotional tone of the new voter.

In recent conventions the vital speech has been the address of acceptance, in which ground is laid for the campaign to come. Governor Stevenson's eloquent introduction of nominee Kennedy, "A man who embodies the hopes of the generation which is rising to power in the world," caught the real significance of the convention. Kennedy's reply showed he probably knew the group of new voters better than anyone else at the convention. His frontal assaults on Richard Nixon pleased the old hands, but most of his speech was for the new. Although he attacked the lack of leadership in the administration, he separated Eisenhower from attack by indicating that Nixon couldn't fill the President's shoes. Actually, Nixon is closer to what Kennedy represents than is

Eisenhower, but many Americans may not know that.

Kennedy recognized his religion as a real issue of the campaign and took the first step to make it an asset. He attacked the problem directly and at length taking a theologically impossible, but politically effective, position that he would never let his religion interfere with his judgment.

To a confused and unsure electorate he offered up an old Turner thesis in a new wrapping. "The New Frontier," "challenges," "courage," "pride," and "sacrifice" are the "God words" of a new rhetoric. "Security" and "complacency" are the "devil words." He would, with Churchill, open no "quarrel between the present and the past . . . in danger of losing the future." "The New Deal and The Fair Deal were bold measures for their generations but now this is a new generation." "We must cast off old slogans." When he closed with "give me your help and your hand and your voice" it was clear that this was the beginning of a rhetoric designed for a new generation. The accent might bother some, the wealthy family might trouble others, the religion might drive some into the GOP camp, but it was clear that a vigorous young man would try in the months ahead to articulate the feelings of a new generation which couldn't remember a depression and to whom slums are a vague memory at best.

Presidential Candidate John F. Kennedy and the Democratic party had staked their political fortune on this new audience. Haltingly at first, the speakers groped for a new rhetoric which only McCarthy and then Kennedy seemed to understand. A new audience has come of age, a new generation of politicians is serving them, and a new rhetoric is being fashioned for our times.

THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION

Russel Windes

Those who oppose the convention system were generously furnished ammunition for their attack in 1960. Arguments that the convention does not reflect the position of party members on the issues of the day, that delegates merely obey the dictates of small cliques and party bosses, and that confirmation and ratification have replaced real debate at the national conventions, are more supportable after the summer of 1960 than before. However, the critic should not assume conventions ought to be discarded without considering the less obvious, but important, functions a convention serves, purposes other than naming a national ticket and writing a party platform. What are these other purposes, and in what way does the convention go about achieving them?

(1) The convention creates, sustains, and communicates images of party candidates and the party itself. (2) The convention creates, sustains, and communicates counter-images of opposing candidates and party. (3) The convention sets the tone and sets up the issues for the campaign which follows, demonstrating to party members how those issues ought to be handled. (4) The convention serves to excite the party faithful to work harder for victory.

Both in the processes of nominating candidates and writing a party platform, and in the fulfillment of the significant convention purposes, the role played by speech is an indispensable one. With the advent of the mass media, particularly television, parties have become increasingly aware of the persuasive opportunities available to them through their conventions to bombard a huge audience with party propaganda. At the same time, the mass media has encouraged the

parties to avoid controversies and floor fights that might convey to the public an impression of a split in the party. As a result, the processes of debate and discussion, as ordinarily seen in the selection of the nominees and the writing of the platform, have in recent years been held to a minimum, while persuasive speaking for the benefit of the mass audience has undergone a renaissance.

In the 1960 Republican Convention in Chicago delegates had little opportunity for debating nominees or platform. The platform, which should be arrived at after extensive expression of party thought, was written mostly in New York by Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Nixon and dictated to Charles Percy, the platform committee chairman, by phone. Mr. Percy's committee of 104, who had been "writing" the platform for a week prior to the phone call, had no alternative to going along with the "Fourteen Points Fifth Avenue" platform. What opposition there was, mostly conservatives who charged Nixon with a "sell-out," capitulated swiftly after the Vice President's arrival in Chicago, and the convention's only real drama was at an end. The battle had been mostly charade anyway. There was almost no opposition to Nixon's candidacy after he and Rockefeller had joined forces, and since Mr. Nixon chose his running mate and the convention simply endorsed, the Republicans had no opportunity for debate on the party nominees.

Although lacking opportunities to thresh out the great issues facing them, the Republicans made the best possible use of the persuasive speech to set their goals and candidates before the country, and to fulfill the four other convention objectives. To the observer it appeared that a ghost-writing staff had prepared almost the same basic draft for each speaker. The speakers merely made personal adaptations and stylistic changes. The result was a series of speeches which hammered the same images and issues into the public mind session after session. One could almost predict what the next speaker would say, so closely did the speeches follow party strategy. In the end there could be no question as to the Republican approach to the 1960 campaign.

The image of the party's candidates was unmistakably clear. Mr. Nixon was the true Horatio Alger character of the twentieth century, who had learned to be energetic, courageous, tough-minded, and calm. The words "experience" and "maturity" could be used interchangeably with those of "Nixon" and "Lodge." Both had eight years' experience at the heart of government. Nixon knew how to deal with the communists, whether in a kitchen in Russia or at a university in Latin America. Lodge was the St. George who had battled the communist dragon in the United Nations for eight long years. Nixon took upon himself the task of convincing people he is now something more than a mere organization man, that he possesses commitments and beliefs and is willing to fight for them.

In creating an image of the Grand Old Party, the Republicans had a more difficult time. The obvious breach between the legions of Goldwater and those of Rockefeller could hardly be healed through oratory. The struggle within the party to present a modern face to the world remained unsolved during the whole of the convention, even though the delegates embraced the Nixon compromise. A majority of the 1331 delegates gave their affection to Goldwater, even if they gave their votes to Nixon. Their reaction was vigorous to a succession of convention speeches far more conservative in nature than liberal. And the public must have been

confused by a party that approved the most liberal platform in its history and at the same time evidenced unabashed love for speakers who did not and could not embrace the platform. The image was, at best, fuzzy.

The image drawn of Kennedy and the Democratic Party was clear. Kennedy was the brash, young, inexperienced aspirant who was trying to buy the White House (as he had bought the Democratic nomination), who was soft on communism, who associated too closely with the intellectuals, and who had no qualifications which would enable him to provide the foreign policy leadership America needed. Kennedy was closely linked to his party, and the Democrats were characterized as the do-gooders, spenders, and promisers, who had a knack for mishandling foreign affairs and involving their nation in war. Democrats wanted to regulate the affairs of people through a strong, and irresponsible, central government. Their policies led to inflation, high taxes, enormous deficits, and welfareism. Worse yet, they were pessimists who had no faith in America's future.

Through the Republican convention speeches, party members and workers were given splendid examples of issues on which the campaign would be fought, and how those issues should be handled. The Republicans would emphasize strongly the issue of foreign policy; Mr. Judd, in his keynote speech, devoted twelve of his eighteen pages to this issue. The Republican approach would be: Disappointments in foreign policy can be blamed on Democratic blunders prior to 1953; in spite of these blunders the present administration has preserved the peace. The Republicans would deny that America is a second-class military power. Under Eisenhower America's defense is second to none; the fact is not disputable; whose word is to be trusted —the greatest military man of the century, or Democratic politicians? The Republicans would support the "Eisenhower-Nixon" accomplishments on the domestic scene, emphasizing prosperity, the absence of inflation, governmental fiscal responsibility, more jobs at more pay, and clean government. Some adjustments would be needed in approaches to problems in agriculture, depressed areas, education, and public health—not that there had been mistakes made in these areas, but that problems of the 1960's demand ever-changing solutions. Finally, those who would criticize this nation's foreign and defense policies were reckless and irresponsible; they worried our allies and gave comfort to our enemies; they undermined Americans' faith in themselves. To criticize and debate is nothing short of joining the cult of professional pessimists who rely upon misinformation and political deceit.

Did the convention speaking serve to excite the party faithful? The answer is an unqualified yes. Possibly with the exception of short speeches by Senator Dirksen, Governor Underwood, and Senator Morton, the speaking was better than in any convention in many years. A happy balance was struck by speakers who directed remarks both to the immediate and the radio-television audience. The immediate audience had adequate opportunity to participate in the speeches and did so gleefully. It was a well-behaved, enthusiastic audience any speaker would have taken to his heart.

What conclusions can be reached regarding the convention's important speeches and their impact? No matter what one thinks of the substance of Walter Judd's keynote speech, its influence must be admitted. No matter how many dead cats he threw out, he gave the dele-

gates what they most wanted and needed, a slashing, rip-roaring, old-fashioned rebuttal of the charges made by the Democrats in Los Angeles. It was a powerful speech, vigorously delivered.

The Eisenhower speech was possibly his best since Pittsburgh in the 1956 campaign. He charged down from his temple and defended his administration's record with a confidence in its rectitude not even Franklin Roosevelt could have bettered. He was enormously successful in sounding righteously indignant about Democratic attacks; his effect on the immediate audience was far greater than one would have suspected from a lame duck President.

Barry Goldwater, the sophisticated and articulate model of Old Guard conservatism, through his speeches, became the undeniable successor to Robert A. Taft's crown. The spokesman for a large number of delegates, he emerged from the convention with strength that the leaders of his party must reckon with. Dewey was still Dewey, and Dirksen was still Dirksen, both seeming not to relish their speaking assignments. Henry Cabot Lodge was both thespian and statesman, and, sustaining his heroic image, he appeared to sell himself completely to the convention.

It remained for Nixon, the 1960 model, to give both the virtuoso performance of the convention, and possibly of his career. His was the task of erasing the image of Nixon the street-fighter, the political sophist who was prepared to reverse himself on almost any great question if the political winds shifted. His was the task of arousing his party to a hard battle, and, at the same time, making a broad, statesmanlike appeal to the nation. His was the task of tearing off the facial shrubbery all of the Eisenhower team-players had long been required to wear, and at last communicate his real thoughts to the people. His speech was expertly done; he spoke with seeming sincerity, maturity, humility, and stature many people had not expected. An aggressive and dramatic speech, running fifty minutes, it fulfilled almost every obligation the man had. To be sure, there were occasional glimpses of the old Nixon, who, when the occasion demanded it, had an instinct for slashing at the jugular vein, but the overall impression was that of a skilled, bold, seasoned fighter. It was the kind of speech many Democrats wished Mr. Kennedy might have given in Los Angeles.

As entertainment the 1960 Republican Convention was only fair. As a laboratory in which to observe stimulating debates on vital issues it was a travesty. But as a workshop which produced some of the finest persuasive speeches in convention history, it was a rhetorician's dream.

LOVE IN SEVERAL MASQUES: NOTES ON THE NEW YORK THEATRE 1959-1960

Alan S. Downer

What should I do with your strong, manly spirited Sketches, full of Variety and Glow?—How could I possibly join them on to the little bit (two inches wide) of Ivory on which I work with so fine a Brush, as produces little effect after much labour?

—JANE AUSTEN

A careless trifle is a nuisance, but everyone cherishes a trifle that has been wrought with distinction. There is unholy joy about succeeding with the little things.

—BROOKS ATKINSON

1.

IN art as in politics, one views with alarm or one salutes with pride from a point of view always clear to one's listeners if not to one's self. For the past decade those who have viewed with alarm the commercial theatre desperately clinging to the diminishing oasis of Times Square have often been engineers in charge of irrigating the former theatrical deserts off Broadway.

Off-Broadway is not easy to define or delimit; it is more of an attitude than a location. Four decades ago, it was the area in Greenwich Village where the serious drama was reborn in America, although its attitudes and its innovations were happily transported to Broadway at the first sign of welcome. After the Second World War it found a new purpose in serving as a showcase for young actors, before they all became stars on television. During this period it became a kind of comédie américaine, offering its patrons what amounted to a repertory of classics, since the spectator who sees a familiar play will be more alert to the player than to the text. Chekhov and Ibsen and Shaw were available nightly in cellars and attics and unimproved night clubs. In those days Off-Broadway was a dingy museum of dramatic art.

Those who remembered the great days of the Provincetown and those affected by the peculiar American conviction that only new plays provide truly vital dramatic experience deplored the timorousness of the aspirants; the avant-garde was performing a rear guard action. In the past few years, the protestants seem to have been heard. Off-Broadway has been growing, not just in recruits, but in public attention. It has spread from downtown to uptown and from east side to west. It has become institutionalized; it has its own playwrights, its own trade journal (*The Village Voice*), its own publishing house (The Grove Press), and its own vision.

The Genius of the Place for some years has been Samuel Beckett and, by attraction or design, his works have determined the Off-Broadway view of life. In earlier plays he broke with the conventions of what was theretofore

Mr. Downer, Professor of English, Princeton University, is co-founder and former chairman of the American Society for Theatre Research. His most recent books on drama, published in 1960, are editions of American Drama *(seven American plays) and* On Plays, Playwrights, and Playgoers *(selections from Booth Tarkington's theatrical correspondence). This is Mr. Downer's fourth annual review of the Broadway season.*

modern drama by localizing his actions in Erewhon, by toying with the unfinishable adventures of untermarionetten, by dressing play and players in splendid tatters. In *Krapp's Last Tape* he moves further into the portentous inane by reducing his cast of characters to one inferoman and a recorder loaded with tapes from the irrecoverable past. He names him with a gesture of contempt, charcterizes him as a banana-eater, and condemns him (and the audience) to listen to the eternal reiteration of his own thoughts half-a-lifetime ago. There are two novelties in this familiar exercise of emotion recollected in futility. One is that the up-to-date tape recorder has replaced the outmoded family album, or memory book full of dance programs and pressed flowers. The other is that the situation simply exists; it is a part of nothing; there is no one to say the pity of it, or the folly of it, or even, the truth of it.

The Off-Broadway spectator is thus rather like Jerry, hero of *The Zoo Story*, Edward Albee's companion piece to *Krapp's Last Tape*. Jerry lives in a rooming house, knows at the most one thing about each of his fellow tenants, but has no contact with them at all. To be sure *The Zoo Story* concentrates on the one moment of his history when he tries to establish a contact with a presumably average fellow-man, but the experienced Off-Broadwayite knows he will fail.

There was a day in the American theatre when the "little man" was a heroic figure. In comedies he was the worm who turned, in tragedies he was the moth who became incandescent in the destroying flame. But for the current avant-garde he is simply little. Of Mr. Albee's two characters, the elder is "neither fat nor gaunt, neither handsome nor homely," the younger has "a great weariness." And Krapp is just plain "wearish." These are our heroes, and how many are their fellows in the contemporary theatre, flabbily young or droopily middle-aged. For these theatres and for their repertory there is no place for vigor, for style, for the well-graced actor, and their audiences look complacently into this mirror of man (perhaps because it is true?).

In *Krapp's Last Tape* an old man falls into a drunken sleep while his mechanically reproduced voice croons over the details of a singularly unenterprising sexual engagement. *The Zoo Story* relates the last hour in the life of a young man who, cut off from his family, has left his native grounds (reason not given), who can make no contact with the strangers among whom he has chosen to live (reason not given), who has decided (reason not given) at this particular hour to establish an entente with a complete stranger momentarily reposing in Central Park. The characters are well-drawn and the dialogue has in it the sound of the human voice; it is the more surprising and disappointing that nothing happens, nothing is changed (on stage or in the audience) by the experience of the two characters. They end as they began, held apart by death as they were by life, but without any suggestion that it should be otherwise. Beckett and Albee have demonstrated again that nothing can come of nothing and still hold an audience.

Even though limited by diminutive playhouses, the success of these dramas suggests that it is out of fashion to desire action, that Aristotle is a deadletter-man, and that the quest for meaning is mere antiquarianism. "Just what were you trying to do?" asks Jerry, "Make sense out of things?" He does not pause for a reply since he might find himself diverted into an argument with some

survivor of the past who remembered the possibility that art was an ordering of experience. The redesigned board that hangs over the entrance to the modernized Globe proclaims that *totus mundus agit holerim,* and Jaques within will announce that all the world's a cabbage patch.

The most successful of the new American plays with the Off-Broadway point of view, Jack Gelber's *The Connection,* not only displays the suspended animation of a cast of junkies, but insistently emphasizes their inability to act. Again, without comment. No one is the victim of his past, or indeed of his present. Addiction is an accepted way of living; there are no regrets, no dreams. If one man is a musician and the other a clerk, it is of no importance; if one is white and another black it matters not which is which. All have drifted to Leach's pad to await the man who brings their daily supply. He comes, they leave, The End. It is interesting to compare Leach's pad with Harry Hope's saloon in *The Iceman Cometh*; it too is filled with addicts incapable of action. Yet their alcoholism makes possible the "pipedreams" necessary to assure them of their humanity. Ironically, there are no "pipedreams" in *The Connection*; the characters seek only "That taste, that little taste."

The spectator must conclude that this is a truthful representation of the life of a narcotic; at least he is assured over and over again by a minor character that "That's the way it really is. That's the way it is." On the other hand it has been often pointed out that O'Neill's alcoholics never show any of the effects of *real* drunkenness. They do not vomit, or groan with hangovers, or lose the power of speech, as do Gelber's junkies. Yet if the spectator leaves the theatre still shuddering from the horror of Leach's overdose, its relation to the other "events" of the play is sufficiently obscure to preclude the generalizing power of O'Neill's symbolic drama.

The audience, in fact, is forbidden to generalize. Says the philosophical junkie, "There's something perverse in looking for meaning all the time." *The Connection* shares some of the fascination of a slumming party of the twenties, or a visit to Bedlam in the eighteenth century. But it carefully refuses to enter into the implications of its locale or its subject. There is no man higher up, no international crime ring, no probing of the psychology of modern man. It is not even a slice of life, but "improvised theatre."

The pad is invaded by the crew of what might be called an Off-Hollywood motion picture company to shoot a neorealistic film. The scriptwriter has improvised a biography for the four addicts he has chosen as heroes, but they reject his improvisations and substitute their own. Once again the conventional critic (or even artist) might rejoice at the possibilities implicit in such a dramatic structure: a conventional dramatic plan played off against both artistic innovation and stubborn truth. But this too is neglected by the playwright—rejected not faulted. Perhaps the Off-Broadway writers are taking their cue from the late poetess who insisted on the importance only of the roseness of the rose. Perhaps they believe that having looked on this picture and on this, there is no reason in the new philosophy for seeing relationships or analogies or meaningful contrasts. Seeing is sufficient. The word is not see and learn, or watch and pray, but look and go away. If this is not to misread their work, a new genre has been added to the repertory of world theatre: existentialist melodrama—if the substantive is not redundant.

It is probably too early to conclude, as has been suggested,[1] that a new concept of dramatic experience is a-borning which will replace the drama as we have known it for a hundred years. Indeed the history of the theatre shows that new concepts seldom replace, but are absorbed into, the accepted mode, as expressionism was tamed to the services of naturalism. In a recent interview, Arnold Wesker, a new English playwright who works in the older tradition of social realism, commented on the manifesto of the proponent of a theatre of artifice:

> John Arden's plea for the poetic theatre is perfectly justified . . . , but he must not start a reaction against a form of theatre which is just as valid. This seems to me to be the tragedy of most movements; they start as a reaction from the old and not in response to something fresh that people have discovered. By all means let John Arden go ahead and strive for the poetic drama, but not at the expense of us; just as I hope we're not emerging at the expense of him. I would have thought there was room for all. The only thing there is not room for is bad drama.[2]

Ibsen may outlive but he did not replace Sardou, Shaw may outlive but he did not replace Pinero, and as for Beckett and Genet and the rest of the Grove Press playwrights, the decision belongs to the future. At this moment in time the hyphen between off and Broadway is securely in place.

2.

Part of the force that keeps the hyphen in place is, of course, mass. If Off-Broadway offerings outnumber Broadway's three to one, the audience even for a success is minute compared to the audience for a moderate success uptown. While such a comparison has nothing to do with quality, it can have a great deal to do with subject matter and attitude. Off-Broadway can afford to reflect the attitude or attitudes of a limited group; Broadway must still concern itself with the general. And it is increasingly apparent that, despite the accusations of conformity directed against the mass of Americans, the audience continues to grow more complex in backgrounds, beliefs, and ways of life. It is difficult to find a subject that can be approached in a way that will be sympathetically comprehended by 1200 people a night for six months. It is even difficult to find an approach that will be uniformly *shocking*. What subjects, what attitudes, will be relevant to such complexity? To what extent can the stage continue its classic function as a mirror of its audience?

Take, for example, the theme which of all themes is of surpassing importance to every component of a republican society: individual responsibility. At least two plays during the season argue this theme in a forum: a court of law and a political convention. Both were superbly acted and staged without kazantics in such a way that attention was constantly directed to the central issue. It is, therefore, justifiable to compare them as jobs of playwriting.

The Andersonville Trial, by Saul Levitt, examines a historical situation not unlike the fictional one handled by Herman Wouk in *The Caine Mutiny Court Martial.* Since the days of Aeschylus a trial has been a sure-fire theatrical gimmick, and Mr. Levitt working to his climax in the approved manner of Henry Arthur Jones traps the defendant into condemning himself with his own words. The commander of a notorious prison camp, he is finally forced to admit that there are times

[1] R. J. Kaufman, "On The Supersession of The Modern Classic Style," *Modern Drama,* II (1960), 358-369.

[2] Arnold Wesker, "Question and Answer," *New Theatre Magazine,* I (April 1960), 7.

when a concern for human dignity should take precedence over the orders of a superior officer. Regardless of the tenability of such a conclusion, it is made human and of immediate concern to the audience by the situation of the prosecutor, a military officer who is himself a member of the system, and who, beginning as merely ambitious and ruthless, is forced to the point of refusing to succumb to the code as the defendant had.

As the action unfolds, Andersonville loses its geographical identity; it is revealed through the words of its victims and of its administrators as hell, and it is apparent that if the military code were equally projected to a symbolic level all members of society would be prisoners of that hell. The conclusion is bold, firm, and humane, but it is not, of course, an answer to the moral issue. Society bears the ultimate responsibility for its moral code, but a democracy at peace is not the same as a democracy at war. Critical reaction was divided: practical, in rejecting the conclusion as a wartime impossibility; liberal, in accepting it without question; or (in one instance) blind to the fact that a moral issue was involved. And the critics may be taken to reflect the audience complex. At the very least, however, *The Andersonville Trial* succeeded in getting its audience to thinking about something beyond the headlines, beyond the stockholder's prospectus, beyond the psychologist's couch.

The Best Man, by Gore Vidal, examines the back-room maneuvering for the presidential nomination at a national convention in Philadelphia. Mr. Vidal is well-qualified to approach the subject, having been brought up in a political atmosphere and himself ambitious for political office. Whether a spectator of *The Best Man* could cast a confident vote for its author is a question that ought to be raised.

For Mr. Vidal is also, in his spare moments, a drama critic and, attacking *The Gang's All Here,* a melodrama about President Harding, he complained of the general timidity and dishonesty of plays about politicians, written by men who were dedicated to giving pleasure rather than to being polemical, satirical, or reforming. His ironic conclusion:

> The Commercialites are shrewd analysts, devising new ways of exploiting the obvious, always on the lookout for a "property" that will "go." The fact that Lawrence and Lee have taken soundings and decided that the audience might accept a political cartoon, neutrally rendered, is a splendid bit of sleuthing and a good omen. . . .[3]

With his other gifts, Mr. Vidal now reveals himself as a skilled reader of omens. For *The Best Man* is a political cartoon, rendered neutral by its astute failure to come to grips with the moral issue it raises. The situation is intriguing: he opposes two candidates for the nomination, the one a man of tarnished domestic life but impeccably eggheaded in public matters, the other a model of both gelatinous domesticity and political opportunism. Give each a weapon out of the other's past: case-history of a nervous breakdown for the egghead, accusation of wartime homosexual activity for the opportunist. Introduce an ex-President, "realistic," the politician of the whistle-stops, sitting midway between the pork and the cracker barrels. Keep handy off-stage a faceless favorite-son. Let the issue be whether the egghead can be driven to use homosexuality as a weapon to defeat the opportunist.

Although the play argues that voters ignored the serious illness of Mr. Eisen-

[3] Gore Vidal, "Debate in the Moonlight," *The Reporter,* XXI (November 12, 1959), 33.

hower, a past history of mental disturbance might well give a voter pause. It would be equally difficult for a proved homosexual to achieve the highest office in the land. But having raised these issues, Mr. Vidal prefers to discuss something else. The heroic egghead refuses to use the noisome weapon (perhaps because it is demonstrably false) and when the convention arrives at a deadlock, throws his votes to the faceless governor, convinced that "Men without faces tend to get elected President, and power or responsibility or honor fill in the features, usually pretty well." The conclusion is optimistic, but hardly organic. If it expresses a general truth, there is no evidence in the play that it would not be as true of the opportunist as of the favorite son. The act of surrender becomes not so much an act of conscience as an act of revenge, if not on the part of the hero on the part of the playwright. The result is a cartoon almost as contemptuous of its subject as *Krapp's Last Tape*. Like "Lawrence and Lee" Mr. Vidal has taken the measure of his audience. The success of either of the major contenders would have forced him to face the issue of demonstrating their fitness or their failure to lead. If he is willing himself to play Brutus, he is unprepared to trust his audience's sympathy with a latter-day Stockman. By raising and dropping the issue of political responsibility, he has revealed once again the problem of subject matter that faces the playwright in the modern American theatre.

And so to bed. For in the drama, as in life, when all else fails there is the eternal fascination of love.

3.

Love has become not merely the solution to the dramatist's search for a subject, but all too often the solution to any problem raised by the action of his play. Yet in this the theatre is but reflecting popular culture. Dear Abby and Dr. Rose Franzblau, the Luce-fers, and the Ladies' Home Journalists, the paperbound herd of psychologists, all have elevated the philosophy of Tin Pan Alley to the dignity of scientific law. Through love the lost are found, the fallen saved, injustice righted, eternal problems happily resolved. There is, to be sure, some vagueness as to the nature of this panacea; is it biological or metabiological, a matter of bed, board, or Buddha? In this vagueness no doubt lies its efficiency, and Mr. Vidal's egghead, having surrendered in the moral battle, achieves a happy end by regaining the confidence of his disenchanted wife. Some years ago the positive image of American life was the Little Tramp, hopping up the empty road into the fade-out supported only by his own individuality. For this the current theatre seems to have substituted boy and girl, or old boy and old girl, hand in hand, heading into the sunset cocktail hour. With the beaming approval of the shade of Rabbi Ben-Ezra.

Paddy Chayevsky, celebrant of the lost little soul in all the available dramatic media, is happy to comply with the encompassing attitude. In *The Tenth Man* he joins a suicidal alcoholic to a young lady possessed of a dybbuk and sends them off to the license bureau with absolute confidence that in this union there is the strength to endure. No doubt it is just a coincidence that Walt Disney chose to release *Pollyanna* in the same season.

Apart from its central idea, *The Tenth Man* is not without its theatrical delights. It presents a progression of incongruities: the ancient rituals of the Jewish faith performed in a slightly converted grocery store; phylacteries and

shawls, the Ark with its scrolls, and a pay telephone; the exorcising of a dybbuk in Mineola, complicated by the greater mystery of the New York subway system. The chorus of ancient believers, unbelievers, and partial believers is altogether wonderful, especially in their debates about the nature of faith.

It is when the play begins to dabble with the nature of love and to equate it with faith that it becomes flabby. The equation is theatrical but not dramatic, not essentially true. A psychiatrist is not a cabalist, and the truth that is revealed by religion is hardly the truth of the consulting room. The result is to slubber the gloss of the new science with the old faith, or vice versa, and the climax, in which the cabalist seems to have exorcised a dybbuk from the young hero (who didn't know he had a dybbuk) while leaving the Whore of Kiev firmly in possession of the young lady who was to have been rescued, is almost as confusing as the apparently optimistic denouement in which the neurotic lovers depart from the Temple to set up a menage à trois that once and for all exhausts the possibilities of the eternal triangle.

Broadway also heard the last words of Jean Giraudoux on the subject of love. *Duel of Angels* (*Pour Lucrèce*) takes place in the south of France in the faded world of the Second Empire, a proper setting for the author's weary pessimism. It restages the death of chaste Lucretia, only to reveal that the catastrophe was caused by Nothingness and its values. The play is no comedy, it is hardly a tragedy, but it is (in the word of Jean-Louis Barrault) "cruel," akin to the mood of Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*. Like Shakespeare, Giraudoux was never hesitant about twisting the *taille* of a legend, but his new view of the ancient Roman matron, which permits him to ring an astonishing set of changes on love, virtue, and justice, is complicated in that he left at his death three different endings. The one finally selected for production fully justifies Barrault's classification.

Lucille Blanchard (neé Lucretia), the personification of strict virtue and domestic honor, reveals the faithlessness of Paola to her husband. In revenge, Paola administers a drug which induces long sleep, during which Lucille is convinced that she has been raped by Marcellus. Paola's husband becomes her champion and kills Marcellus, but Lucille's own husband, the local Justice, believing her a complaisant victim, rages against her pose of purity for cheating him of fleshly pleasures. Realizing that her honor has been systematically violated during all the years of her marriage, Lucille kills herself, and an old bawd pronounces her eulogy in a curse almost as universal as Shakespeare's pandarean epilogue.

So related, the plot sounds melodramatic enough, and André Maurois has said the first act is Giraudoux, the second, with its duel, *Monte Cristo*, and the third, with its idealistic suicide, *Hernani*,[4] but such a description is not as depreciatory as M. Maurois intended. Like the original Parisian production, the current production imported from London is highly stylized. The simplest act, serving an ice, placing a pair of gloves on a table, reading a document, is performed caressingly like the movements of a pas de ballet. Consequently the play in English seems almost intolerably slow, since the principle on which the stylization has been based is largely omitted in Christopher Fry's adaptation.

[4] Donald Inskip, *Jean Giraudoux* (London, 1958), p. 164.

Stylization in a modern play must justify itself. The recent visit of the Grand Kabuki was an interesting demonstration of this principle. Each program was an anthology beginning with a classic presented in the ritualized style of its period. This was followed by more modern selections with the elements of classic style retained in the interpretation and justified by the earlier direct presentation of the tradition. A justification for the stylization of *Duel of Angels* lies in its multiple allusions to an older theatre, most of which were deleted by Fry or his producer.

Pour Lucrèce begins as an allegory with Marcellus announcing that he has been cast in the role of Vice by Justice Blanchard. Marcellus then rings a gong and announces the entrance of Virtue, the protagonist Lucille. Paola casts herself as Beauty and Revenge, and her affinity with the Devil of the old morality plays is revealed as she hisses like a snake. The situation at any moment can be overlaid by an analogy to the classic dramas of Love and Faith. The husbands of Aix become Tartuffes, Marcellus is Don Juan, and his opponent the Commander. Desdemona's handkerchief and the stain on Lady Macbeth's hand make their classic appearances. In fact the situations and the very language of the work are so constantly allusive to the theatre in general that its structure might be described as a kind of dramatic lamination, and its theme the paradox that if all men are actors, the actor has ultimately no way of knowing the nature of the character he has chosen or been cast to play.

Pour Lucrèce is a teasing play of wit and despair; *Duel of Angels* is a modish approximation of its complexities. It is not, however, such a reduction that it will fit in the Broadway omnibus named Love beside *The Tenth Man*, or *Cheri*, or *A Loss of Roses*. *Cheri*, a kind of Lolita in reverse, wrapped a tawdry passion in sateen and was very pitiful in surprise pink. In William Inge's briefly seen *A Loss of Roses* a tent-show Venus cures a gas-station Adonis of an Oedipus complex in an action whose only freshness lies in the casebook predictability of every character, every action, and every consequence. Peter Shaeffer's *Five Finger Exercise* stood out from the monochromatic backdrop of middle class domestic infelicity because of an enchantingly drawn teen-ager, literate dialogue, and a performance of great strength by Jessica Tandy; but its teutonic deus ex machina could only point out that a little love and understanding would have set matters right. It takes a heap of loving to make a box set a success.

One play of the season was bold enough to question Guest's Law, and because it was written with a firm hand and a firm mind and an understanding heart it achieved that magnitude which long ago was declared essential to serious drama. Lillian Hellman's *Toys in the Attic* does not deal with extraordinary persons nor with a heroic milieu. The characters and setting indeed are similar to those regularly associated with Tennessee Williams. But there is nothing decadent in the style or structure of the play, and the characters do not beg for pity from the audience. If the art is spare, the judgment is unsparing.

Two spinster sisters live in the faded ugliness of their family home. Their devoted brother, Julian, newly married, returns with the profits of a real-estate speculation and loads them with the luxuries denied them by a life of daily grubbing for subsistence. The situation, dear to the theatre since *A Christmas Carol*, is memorable for its difference.

The sisters sit draped in inappropriate splendor, the elder like a bewildered scarecrow, the younger like Queen Victoria in a brothel. The brother, spooning caviar out of a tin can and drinking champagne from a jelly glass, blinkingly senses that his dream of a homecoming which would be a triumphant repayment of a lifetime debt is not somehow being realized. It would be easy to conclude that, like Willy Loman, he had dreamed the wrong dream, that his values had been corrupted by a materialistic society. It would be easy, but it would be wrong.

Miss Hellman is examining the multiple meanings of the tie that binds Julian to the other characters. For his elder sister it is an unselfish desire that he achieve independence, for his mother-in-law it is the affluence that can justify indifference, for his wife it is physical love, the only gift in her limited means. For Carrie, his younger sister, it is a kind of vampirism. She has built her life on the history of her brother's failures. As the action of the play reveals itself, the audience recognizes that it is in the presence of a force of evil, newly perceived, evil wearing the mask of love, generosity, motherliness. Carrie Berniers is one of the little foxes.

She does not, however, come from the Hubbard's part of the forest but from a region deeper and darker. It is a region untouched by the artist-sociologist or the artist-psychologist, a region to be penetrated only by the artist-moralist. And its creatures require not sympathy or understanding but judgment. Carrie is possessed by a force that cannot be exorcized by cabalist, analyist, or social reformer. She is no draculean image of capitalism, no Satan lusting for revenge, and no more incestuous than Ferdinand in *The Duchess of Malfi*. She is what evil must eternally be, the other side of good. She is tragic because she can never be made to know of her enslavement, because she can never have the opportunity of escape. Her tremendous vitality, her willing sacrifice of her own pleasures and necessities, her kindness and charity, industry and devotion ultimately will destroy whatever she professes to love.

In any season, *Toys in the Attic* would be an important play, not just for its discovery of Carrie Berniers, but for the impeccable style of its writing and the tension and economy of its structure. In the past season it was perhaps the only play to be regretted when the actors' strike closed the Broadway theatres for a few weeks at its end. In spite of editorials and letters to the editor it is difficult to see who was really hurt when the theatres shut down, except the members of the profession and the wholesalers who entertain out-of-town buyers. It is apparent that the Broadway theatre is in one of its periodic slumps, but not for economic reasons, or for a lack of talented actors and producers. Broadway needs writers who are not content to scrawl pleasant questions of love on their two inches of ivory, who are not content with small things excellently done. The times that try men's souls are just beginning and the success of the "strong, manly, spirited" *Toys in the Attic* gives notice that audiences are eager to be taken out of the consulting room and the confessional into the wide and universal theatre where every man can discover his own image.

THE NORTH AMERICAN SERVICE OF RADIO MOSCOW

William S. Howell

INTERNATIONAL broadcasting by amplitude modulated radio is a major propaganda effort in the Soviet Union. Daily broadcasting takes place in thirty-nine languages, with several "services" often being presented in a single language. For example, in English we have the North American Service and the Pacific Coast Service, both using middle-western U.S. speech, and British and Far Eastern Services in a standard British dialect. Possibly other broadcasting in English is done to particular audiences. Radio Moscow attempts a rather comprehensive coverage of regional, political, and language groupings. Substantial broadcast periods and a variety of frequencies appear to be general practice. The North American Service is on the air daily for seven hours, 5 P.M. to 12 midnight CST, from at least ten different transmitters. High wattage and wide choice of frequencies are fairly successful in overcoming distortions, interference, and other irregularities in long-distance short-wave listening. Frequencies are changed at intervals throughout the year to take advantage of atmospheric conditions associated with particular seasons.

The international broadcasting of Radio Moscow is located near Gorky Street, northwest of Red Square, directly behind one of Moscow's landmarks, an imposing statue of Pushkin. Broadcasting facilities are housed in three large and very old four-story buildings with some probable overflow into adjacent housing. Much of the interior space of these venerable box-like structures has been converted into plain but well-designed radio studios and associated control rooms. Each language "team" uses a particular studio, or sometimes more than one when there are multiple services in that language. We were told that a new Radio-TV center is under construction "across the river" in which all domestic and foreign radio and television will be housed.

Because the North American Service of Radio Moscow appears to illustrate usual practices of this "Voice of America in Reverse" enterprise, let us look at it more closely. The modern era of broadcasting to North America began sixteen years ago when Joseph Adamov joined the staff. He is still active in the North American Service, and the evidence accumulated through nine years of regular listening and from conversations with the Radio Moscow staff indicates that he has dominated that operation and that his ideas have rather largely determined current programming and broadcasting practices. Mr. Adamov has also been Chief of English Language Interpreters in the U.S.S.R. and has served for many years as an official "greeter," welcoming visiting American dignitaries

Mr. Howell is Professor of Speech and Associate Chairman of the Department of Speech and Theater Arts, University of Minnesota. For ten years he has recorded and studied the propaganda broadcasting of Radio Moscow's North American Service. In 1958 he visited Radio Moscow. A companion article on production details will be published in Journal of Broadcasting.

to the Soviet Union. His functions as chief interpreter and "greeter" obviously are useful to his central assignment in the North American Service.

In an interview in Moscow we asked Joe Adamov and Alexander Alexandrov, the Director of English Language Broadcasting for Radio Moscow, about their objectives. What do they hope to accomplish by extensive and expensive short-wave radio broadcasting to the people of North America? Adamov stated two purposes: (1) To communicate a cross section of true information about Soviet people to people in the U. S. and Canada (*true* was emphasized); (2) To build a favorable attitude toward the U.S.S.R.

These non-sensational claims would probably fit much of Voice of America broadcasting. Certainly they have long been accepted as central goals of international propaganda.

1.

What are the recent trends in Radio Moscow's North American Service? To trace the evolution of current practices would require elaborate documentation. In nine years of systematic monitoring, major and minor trends have been detected. The interpretations are personal, of course, and should be so considered. The statements are in the context of September, 1958, when the author visited Radio Moscow.

Apparently the management of the North American Service has decided that good music has propaganda value. Increasing emphasis upon music has produced fifteen-minute and half-hour periods of well-planned Soviet classical or folk music and, most recently, of American popular music. Most of the latter has been recorded in the United States. Music periods were formerly interrupted by short features carrying political messages, but now music programs tend to consist only of music and a strictly musical narration or commentary. Annette Henkina, an announcer with the North American Service since 1943, handles most of the music program very capably. She led us to believe that she and Nicolai Sergeyev, the relatively new music director, had influenced the North American Service to permit substantial periods of uninterrupted music and music commentary.

In an effort to establish close contact with the American listener the North American Service of Radio Moscow has for several years broadcast an increasing number of tape-recorded interviews with visiting Americans. The first day we were in Moscow, a bright young man with a portable tape recorder approached us in the Intourist headquarters at the National Hotel. He identified himself as David Yunanoff and explained that he was a correspondent for Radio Moscow, making recordings of interviews with visitors for the North American Service. "Recording Correspondents" are sufficiently active that nearly every day Americans can be heard on Radio Moscow, telling about their experiences in the Soviet Union.

A related trend is the more complete and frequent identification of Americans who write letters to Radio Moscow. Until well after the fighting was finished in Korea, Radio Moscow would answer a listener's questions but would mention only the correspondent's initials and his city or state. For example, the announcer might say, "P. L. of California sends us this question." Now they tend to give the full name and home town, and occasionally add a street address. At any rate, it is easily possible to identify and locate these Americans whose correspondence has been mentioned on

Radio Moscow since approximately 1956.

There has been an effort to locate and identify American listeners through encouraging people to send in questions and comments. In the current printed program schedule for North American and Pacific Coast Services, which is published twice a year and sent to the total list of known or prospective listeners, is the following request, prominently displayed inside the back cover:

TO ALL OUR LISTENERS

If you have any specific questions about life in the USSR, which you would like answered in one of our feature programs or by mail:

If you have any questions or comment on Soviet-American relations or other international problems, which you would like to offer as topics to be discussed in our broadcasts;

If there is any particular music you would like to have played at your request—

Don't hesitate to let us know.

Please mention which Service you listen to: The North American or the Pacific Coast.

You will receive advance notice on when to listen to the answer to your request.

Reception reports are always welcome. If QSL is requested, don't forget to mention in your report such essentials as: day and hour of reception, waveband and megacycles, items of program heard.

Color postcards with views of Soviet cities are enclosed in all letters from Radio Moscow as a souvenir.

Our mailing address is:

RADIO MOSCOW
MOSCOW, USSR

A preceding printed program, the "summer schedule" for 1957, contained a more direct attempt to get listener response and evaluation. A separate sheet was inserted with spaces in which to write answers to direct questions:

Dear Listener:

We will be much obliged if you take the trouble to answer the following questions:

1. How often do you listen to Radio Moscow and at what time?

2. What do you enjoy in our programs and what don't you like?

3. Is there anything pertaining to life in the Soviet Union that you would like to have described in our programs?

Please fill in your answers on this questionnaire and mail to RADIO MOSCOW, MOSCOW, USSR.

Thank you in advance, we are

Yours sincerely,
RADIO MOSCOW

Two experiments have been made to assess listenership through contests and the awarding of prizes. The first was Intercontinental Quiz which early in 1957 presented nine questions, three each day, dealing with Soviet accomplishments and Soviet-American relations. A similar event was the "40th Anniversary Quiz" to celebrate the founding of the Communist Party, broadcast in the spring of 1958. Prizes for sending in correct answers were substantial, including books, stamp collections, phonograph records, and reproductions of oil paintings from various galleries. Radio Moscow claims a "heavy response" to both these Madison Avenue type ventures.

The handling of news broadcasts has demonstrated the readiness of the North American Service staff to study and copy American practices. Although they adhere to the European method of alternating male and female voices in the reading of news, the rest of the news presentation is much like that of a radio station in the United States. News is broadcast "every hour on the hour." Fairly recently "Headlines of the News," a forty-five second to one minute digest of the major news items to be treated later in expanded form has begun each newscast. Less recently "commentary" has been separated from "news," and the typical newscast of ten minutes is followed by about five minutes of Soviet opinion on a currently controversial is-

sue—à la Ed Murrow, first the news, and then the commentary.

Analysis of recorded programs from recent years reveals several gradual changes in certain elements of language usage that occur in various North American Service features. There has been a phonetic evolution. British speech has been eliminated from the broadcasts as have all regional dialects of the United States except General American. Apparently Radio Moscow has adopted the same standards of speech used by American radio networks as guides to "correct" pronunciation. There is less belligerent and inflammatory language used than formerly. During the Korean War, for example, Radio Moscow might address its United States listeners as "treacherous war-mongers" and expect sympathetic attention to a Russian point of view in the next paragraph. Now, very little viciously "loaded" language is to be found in North American Service broadcasts and, when it does occur, it is most explicitly applied to a few men in Washington who are asserted to be tragically misleading the American people.

Perhaps the most interesting change in language usage is a pronounced swing toward informality. Slang and colloquialisms are used abundantly, contractions are frequent, and most of the performers frequently use the direct forms of address. "I," "you," and "we" enter into continuity routinely, whereas they were almost totally absent from the formal radio speech typical of the North American Service of seven or eight years ago. Announcers are now using personal references—telling about their homes, families, hobbies, and habits—with the result that instead of being merely disembodied voices they are becoming radio personalities.

The "top" program in the North American Service's week of broadcasting is "Moscow Mailbag." This is a half-hour, round-table discussion in which three of the more able performers answer questions sent in by listeners. A comparison of "Moscow Mailbag" programs broadcast in 1951 with those of 1958 reveals rather convincingly the trends toward informality and less violent language. This content analysis of language used in "Moscow Mailbag" programs is based on seven broadcasts in 1951 and eight in 1958, and indicates these trends:[1]

	Instances Per Program	
	1951	1958
Personal References	.13	29.00
Loaded words (inflammatory, belligerent)	6.30	.12
Contractions	.00	11.70
Slang	.00	1.20
Idioms	.00	3.10
Colloquial Interjections	1.80	49.20

A frankly experimental approach to international broadcasting seems to be favored in current operation of the North American Service. Subjects formerly taboo are treated to open discussion, such as the favorable attitude of Soviet society toward atheism, and basic differences between capitalistic democracy and Soviet communism. Radio Moscow staff members assert that they like to answer the "hottest" questions sent in, those which would seem to cause them most embarrassment. They fill unusual requests, such as playing "The Star Spangled Banner," magnificently recorded by a Moscow orchestra.

Some program exchanges have been arranged with radio stations in the United States. Bert Cowlan of WBAI-FM in New York travelled to Moscow to complete arrangements for a music exchange with the North American Service that amounted to one full concert

[1] From content analysis study (unpublished) made at the University of Minnesota by Irene Faffler in 1958.

per week.[2] While we were at Radio Moscow we heard a five-minute tape-recorded program especially recorded by North American Service for radio station KROD in El Paso, Texas. Apparently Radio Moscow is experimenting with exchanges and other special relationships with agencies within the United States in hope of developing new techniques of carrying their propaganda messages across national boundaries.

Our generalizations about trends and changes in the North American Service of Radio Moscow over the past eight years might suggest two further tentative conclusions: that rather capable people have been working fairly diligently at improving the operation and that, in terms of the tastes and interests of possible listeners in the United States, present programs are more acceptable than were earlier efforts.

2.

To estimate the impact of the North American Service upon American listeners we need to know who listens. This information is at present not available and it is unlikely that any definite data, qualitative or quantitative, will be produced by studies and surveys in the foreseeable future. Questionnaire and interview attempts to measure listening and viewing practices as related to our domestic radio and TV have proved to be quite unreliable, and certainly we could expect that a question such as "How many hours a week do you listen to Radio Moscow?" might yield less than frank answers from contemporary American interviewees.

Consequently, we can only speculate about the size, nature, and listening habits of the audience reached by the North American Service. There are two main considerations, here, which make speculation worthwhile. One is the technical nature of the broadcasts and their availability. The other is known trends in consumption of electronic mass media. Both somewhat delimit the potential Radio Moscow audience in at least the United States. Since effect can only be estimated in terms of a known audience, we should look carefully at whatever evidence and reasoning might lead us to even tentative conclusions about that audience.

First, what technical factors help us to define a probable audience? Obviously, the major prerequisite to becoming a listener to Radio Moscow is regular access to a short-wave radio receiver. Radios for use in the home in the pre-television era quite frequently incorporated short-wave bands in addition to the broadcast band but in recent production of radio receivers emphasis upon short wave has been steadily reduced. Table-model receivers predominate, and small radios are less likely to be multi-wave than are the large console phono-radio combinations. Also, attention has shifted from short-wave to frequency modulation, with the development of "good music" FM stations. Now, a dual-purpose receiver tends to be AM and FM, with only one broadcast band, rather than broadcast and short wave as it was before television became popular.

Hence, only a small proportion of our population has the physical possibility of tuning in the North American Service. But if there is a short-wave receiver in the home, further technical difficulties make listening to Radio Moscow unlikely. The short-wave section of a dual-purpose home receiver is usually not as powerful or as well designed as the part made to receive the broadcast band. Typically, it has not been main-

[2] Nat Hentoff, "Mr. Cowlan Goes to Moscow," *The Reporter*, XIX (October 30, 1958), 33-34.

tained well because it is not frequently used. Usually it is out of alignment. Because of the nature of high-frequency radio signals (short wave), alignment of sets should be made more frequently and more precisely than for the broadcast band. As a result, the short-wave section of the usual home radio receiver is a highly inefficient mechanism. Add to this the fact that the signals from Moscow are weak and frequently almost buried in interference, and it would appear unlikely that any significant amount of regular listening to Radio Moscow takes place in American homes using home-type radio receivers.

Further, short-wave listening over great distances is strikingly unreliable when compared to reception of nearby domestic broadcasting stations. Because of what the radio ham terms "atmospherics," the station you wish to hear may "fade out" and be gone for days at a time, or it may simply deteriorate into unintelligibility during a single program. "Interference," a blanket term covering all unwanted noises that prevent your hearing a selected signal clearly, is much more annoying on the short waves than in regular broadcast frequencies. Electric razors, household appliances, electric gadgets of all sorts raise hob with short-wave listening. In fact, an urban listener may find that satisfactory short-wave reception in his home is categorically impossible.

Another irritating condition of short-wave communication is that reception is worst in winter, best in summer. Time for listening and inclination to do so are high in winter, low in summer, in general. This further frustrates the curious citizen who might like to keep track of "What Radio Moscow is saying these days."

In most locations in the United States, regular listening to the North American Service can be accomplished comfortably and satisfactorily only if you have a communication-type receiver attached to a short-wave antenna located outside of your living quarters, away from sources of electrical interference. With this fairly rare combination you can tune in one of the North American Service channels clearly enough for easy listening approximately one evening in three, on the average, and in winter reception will be impossible for as much as a week at a time. Getting enough of Radio Moscow to understand what its programs are about demands working at listening steadily and persistently, even if you have high quality short-wave receiving equipment.

When we look at factors other than technical considerations, we see some would seem to restrict possible listening to Radio Moscow, whereas some might facilitate it. Our overall trend away from radio listening to television viewing during evening hours is well established, and we should remember that Radio Moscow comes to us from 5 P.M. to 12 midnight, CST. Competitive entertainment from FM and AM radio and from television might keep possible listeners from trying for Radio Moscow on most occasions. The people who own and use the best equipment for short-wave listening are radio amateurs, or "hams," quite possibly less interested in politics and in international broadcasting than is the average American. If you disagree with this last opinion, we suggest you monitor conversations among the "hams" on short wave and note the approximate percentage of time devoted to discussion of political matters or to international affairs!

Two features of programming in the North American Service make listening more convenient than it would be otherwise. One is news every hour, on the

hour, with commentary after almost every newscast. The other is selective repetition of programming, so that if a listener drops by for an hour or so at any time during the broadcast day, he will be exposed to all major messages. Sometimes items of key importance, e.g., a statement by Khrushchev at a time of crisis, are broadcast over and over again, as often as once every twenty minutes. Finally, our press encourages citizens to listen to Radio Moscow by reporting, often headlining, items which were broadcast by Radio Moscow. Probably these news stories and comments by columnists influence Americans to try to "pick up" the North American Service, and remind occasional listeners to tune in more frequently than would otherwise be the case.

To summarize our speculation about the probable or potential audience for the North American Service, the factors enumerated lead us to conclude that the number of regular listeners in the United States is small indeed, at least in comparison to the size of the audience for any of our domestic mass media. The effort involved in listening to Radio Moscow would seem to demand a special motivation, such as an interest in the process of persuasion characteristic of the student of propaganda, or the zeal of the person keenly interested in the U.S.S.R. and in Soviet Communism. Those interested in Soviet affairs may be partisan or merely curious. These, one suspects, are the central targets of the North American Service propaganda enterprise. Whether the Russians have any accurate notions concerning the size of this group or of its membership is one of the highly important questions we are not likely to answer.

What impressions come from years of monitoring the North American Service of Radio Moscow? Here are some subjective and personal generalizations about procedures and content of this substantial propaganda effort.

Compared to Voice of America, Radio Moscow is openly dedicated to persuasion. It hits hard at several obvious and currently controversial propositions each day.

News over Radio Moscow is factually accurate but highly selected and freely interpreted to develop the day's propaganda themes. There is no pretext of presenting a cross section of world happenings in a single newscast.

The persuasive presentation of news developed by Radio Moscow challenges the student of content analysis. A listener at first finds nothing unusual in the regular newscast. It seems to consist of assorted happenings of the day, coming from many points around the world. Possibly the frequency of non-objective words (loaded language) is noted because this is the most obvious difference between their news and ours.

But when a newscast is studied in typescript, a pattern emerges. An analyst can readily brief a newscast. A number of related main and supporting propositions are camouflaged by other current items of news and varied arrangements. Here are the propositions argued in a Radio Moscow newscast of May 9, 1960 (two days after the announcement that Russia had our U-2 plane and Francis Gary Powers), with the intermixed items in parentheses. This brief changes the order of some items, since supporting propositions often precede main propositions, effectively concealing argumentation.

I. The Soviet Government does everything that it can to avoid war.

A. It makes pleas for total disarmament

B. It calls for stronger peace and friendship.

C. It calls for broader international trade, cultural ties, and tourist travel.

II. The American spy plane incident was nothing but aggression.

III. The spy plane flights of America are causing negative reactions all over the world.
A. A Rear Admiral in the United States Navy said that it should not have happened.
B. A Russian Parliament member said it was staged to ruin the Summit Conference.
C. A Japanese Socialist blamed the American brass for the flight.
D. Japanese Socialists claim it was done to ruin the Summit Conference.
E. The Japanese opposition wants American air bases removed.
(Plane crash on the Island of Formosa.)
(West German official appeals for a peace treaty with the U.S.S.R.)

IV. Russia urges a treaty with Germany and is opposed.
A. If there is not going to be a treaty with unified Germany then Russia will conclude a treaty with East Germany alone.
B. A West German says that the heads of government should risk war rather than have a unified German peace treaty.
C. A prominent East German supports Khrushchev and attacks Adenauer.
(Canadian visit to Washington.)
(Indonesian president visits in Cuba.)

V. The United States government still supports dictator Syngman Rhee.
(Visit in Moscow of group from Vocational Training Association.)
(Amateur radio operators contest.)
(Weather news from Moscow.)[3]

The variety of programs offered by the North American Service is impressive. There is something of interest to everyone, from the theatre enthusiast to the stamp collector.

Broadcast time is quite evenly divided between the two central objectives of "selling" the U.S.S.R. interpretation of international events and what might be called "domestic bragging." The latter category tells us of accomplishments in the Soviet Union to date, and points to much greater achievements to come. These claims are supported comprehensively by "future statistics."

The role played by the North American Service is that of a thoughtful informant meeting the needs of American listeners who want to help the cause of U.S.—U.S.S.R. friendship. Fresh, firsthand information about the Soviet Union is supplied with a warm congeniality and an apparent frankness that may well disarm the mildly hostile persuadee, particularly if he is exposed over some period of time.

The North American Service of Radio Moscow is an efficient and extensive propaganda-dispensing operation. It is sensitive to events and general conditions in the United States. Financial support of the enterprise is impressive. The performing and producing staffs are sophisticated, well-educated, and talented in their medium. In recent years programs have evolved through vigorous experimentation in a way that supports "Boss" Alexandrov's claim that he has the most avant-garde unit of international broadcasting in the world.

But we have no evidence that the North American Service has a significant impact in the United States or Canada. The size of the probable audience is so extremely small that effects would seem to be negligible. Radio Moscow personnel were not receptive to comments concerning factors limiting the reception of their programs in the United States. Probably this was a symptom of a self-perpetuating bureaucracy, the tendency of an agency to resist intelligence that points to its own elimination.

[3] From content analysis study (unpublished) made at the University of Minnesota by James Connolly in the summer of 1960.

PERSUASION AND THE CONCEPT OF IDENTIFICATION

Dennis G. Day

KENNETH BURKE'S *A Rhetoric of Motives,* published in 1950, which crystallizes theories he has been expounding since 1931,[1] purports to present a "new" kind of rhetoric, the key concept of which is *identification.* Writing in the *Journal of General Education* Burke states: "If I had to sum up in one word the difference between the 'old' rhetoric and the 'new' . . . I would reduce it to this: the key term for the 'old' rhetoric was 'persuasion' and its stress was upon deliberate design. The key term for the 'new' rhetoric would be 'identification,' which can include a partially unconscious factor in appeal."[2]

Professor Hochmuth, writing in *QJS,* has called Burke "the most profound student of rhetoric now writing in America."[3] She suggests that "Burke deserves to be related to the great tradition of rhetoric."[4] Some effort in this direction has been made. Professor Hochmuth, in her article in *QJS* just cited, was instrumental in introducing Burke to the speech field. Virginia Holland's articles on Burke in *QJS* have also been helpful; and her new book, *Counterpoint,* which compares the rhetorical theories of Burke and Aristotle is a big step in the effort to relate Burke to the classical tradition.[5]

For many of us, however, the meaning of the key term of Burke's "new" rhetoric, *identification,* remains nebulous. The purpose of this paper is to discuss Burke's concept of identification as a rhetorical tool, its philosophical basis, and its relation to some modern trends in rhetorical theory. We shall discover that Burke's concept of identification is an extension of traditional rhetorical theory, that it is based upon his philosophical concept of "substance," and that the concept of identification itself is expressed implicitly in the writings of A. E. Phillips and explicitly in James Winans' book, *Public Speaking.*

Burke generally conceives of rhetoric in traditional terms. Almost one half of *A Rhetoric of Motives* is devoted to what he titles "traditional principles of rhetoric." He defines rhetoric in a way which he frankly admits is Aristotelian: "Rhetoric is the art of persuasion, or a study of the means of persuasion available for any given situation."[6] He contends that rhetoric "involves the use of verbal symbols for the purposes of appeal" and thus "splits into the three ele-

This article is a revision of a paper read at the first "Debut" program at the SAA Convention, Washington, D. C., 1959. The papers read were selected by a national committee of which W. Norwood Brigance was the chairman. Another paper in the series, "A Re-Evaluation of Campbell's Doctrine of Evidence," by Lloyd F. Bitzer was published in the April, 1960 QJS. *Mr. Day is a graduate of College of the Pacific and is a Fellow in Speech at the University of Illinois.*

[1] Kenneth Burke, *Counterstatement* (New York, 1931).

[2] Kenneth Burke, "Rhetoric—Old and New," *Journal of General Education,* V (April 1951), 203.

[3] Marie Hochmuth, "Kenneth Burke and the 'New Rhetoric,'" *QJS.* XXXVIII (April 1952), 144.

[4] *Ibid.,* p. 134.

[5] L. Virginia Holland, *Counterpoint: Kenneth Burke and Aristotle's Theories of Rhetoric* (New York, 1959).

[6] Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives* (New York, 1950), p. 46.

ments of speaker, speech, and spoken-to. . . ."[7] He considers the basic purpose of rhetoric to be "the use of words by human agents to form attitudes or to induce actions in other human agents."[8] As far as the nature and purpose of rhetoric are concerned, Burke is in accord with traditional thought.

It is in the means of achieving persuasion that Burke's approach appears unique. He contends that persuasion can be achieved only through identification. Identification at its simplest he puts in terms of the joining of interests: "A is not identical with his colleague, B. But insofar as their interests are joined, A is *identified* with B. Or he may *identify himself* with B even when their interests are not joined, if he assumes that they are. . . ."[9] For example, the politician says to the farm group, "I was a farm boy myself."

Burke states further that "to identify A with B is to make A 'consubstantial' with B."[10] He considers things to be "consubstantial" if they are united or identified in a common interest, if they partake in some way of the same "substance." It is in Burke's concept of "substance" that we find the philosophical basis for his concept of identification. In regard to the notions of "substance" and "consubstantiality" he writes: "Substance in the old philosophies, was an *act;* and a way of life is an *acting together;* and in acting together, men have common sensations, concepts, images, ideas, and attitudes that make them *consubstantial.*"[11] Any sensation, concept, image, idea, or attitude which we use to identify "substance" Burke calls a "property."[12] And when two "substances" share in a common "property" they are said to be "consubstantial."

This notion of "property" includes much more than the concept of economic property. It is derived from Burke's theory of the social development of man. He holds that "man's moral growth is organized through properties, properties in goods, in services, in position or status, in citizenship, in reputation, in acquaintanceship and love."[13] He maintains that to achieve persuasion the speaker must identify his "properties" with his hearers' "properties." To do this he must give his hearers the appropriate "signs" in his speech; Burke says that "'persuasion' . . . involves communication by the signs of consubstantiality, the appeal of identification."[14] He adds, "You persuade a man only insofar as you can talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, identifying your ways with his."[15]

We see how a speaker uses identification to achieve persuasion from Burke's remark that "a speaker persuades an audience by the use of stylistic identification. . . ."[16] In other words, to persuade rhetorically you use language fashioned in such a way that it gives "signs" of the identity of the "properties" of speaker and hearer. These "stylistic identifications" Burke calls "strategies." Identification itself is the "strategy" which encompasses the whole area of language usage for the purposes of inducement to action or attitude. It stands as the head of an implicit hierarchy of strategies, the totality of which includes all the available means of persuasion.

The "strategies" to which Burke refers are not unfamiliar to us. He cites the ideas of classical authors such as

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 271.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 41.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 20.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 21.
[11] *Ibid.*
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 23.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 24.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 62.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 55.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 46.

Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian on logical, ethical, and pathetic proof, enthymemes, examples, topics, and figures of speech, as all being "strategies" serving the purpose of identification.

Burke's theory of persuasion encompasses much of what we consider classical rhetoric. We might even say that the concept of identification, which is the key term in Burke's rhetoric, is simply an extension of classical doctrine. Identification has its philosophical basis in Burke's conception of "substance" as an "act" and social intercourse as an "acting together."

Burke's theory of persuasion can be summarized in this way: The speaker, by using linguistic "strategies" which give "signs" to his hearers that his "properties" are similar to or identical with their "properties," achieves identification or "consubstantiality" and thereby achieves persuasion. And for Burke, persuasion can be achieved only through the "strategy" of identification.

Whereas the philosophical context in which Burke discusses identification is unique, the concept itself is not unique to modern American rhetorical theory. We encounter the idea of identification in the works of two important writers of the early part of this century, A. E. Phillips and James A. Winans.

The central concept put forth in Phillips' *Effective Speaking*, first published in 1908, is the principle of *reference to experience*. Phillips writes: "Reference to Experience . . . means reference to the known. The known is that which the listener has seen, heard, read, felt, believed, or done, and which still exists in his consciousness. . . . It embraces all those thoughts, feelings, and happenings which are to him real. Reference to Experience, then, means *coming into the listener's life*."[17] Phillips is saying that the speaker must associate or identify his purpose with the knowledge, interests, and motives of his audience. The difference between Phillips and Burke is that Phillips admits only conscious factors in appeal, whereas Burke, following Freudian psychology, allows both conscious and subconscious motives. We more clearly see the similarity between the principles of reference to experience and identification in this statement from Phillips: "We must remember that our listeners are individuals, with individual ideas, individual feelings, individual beliefs, and that our problem is to liken the thing or things we seek to attain to some equivalent in *their* stock of knowledge—refer to *their* experience."[18] Phillips, in summarizing the means of achieving clearness, impressiveness, and belief, remarks: "To attain *Clearness* liken the *unknown* to the *known*, To attain *Impressiveness* liken the *unfelt* to the *felt*, To attain *Belief* liken the *unaccepted* to the *accepted;* in every case trying to select from the listener's experience, as best you can, the seen, felt, accepted thing that has the most vivid resemblance."[19]

From these statements by Phillips we see the close resemblance between the principle of reference to experience and the concept of identification. Both principles involve the use of materials by the speaker in such a way as to associate his interests with the interests of his hearers.

James A. Winans in *Public Speaking*, first published in 1915, puts forth the theory of *attention* as the central concept of his rhetoric. In support of his attention theory Winans discusses the idea of the speaker finding a *common ground*

[17] Arthur Edward Phillips, *Effective Speaking* (Chicago, 1921), p. 28.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 32.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

with his hearers. It is in regard to this idea that Winans not only discusses the theory of identification but actually calls it by this name. He writes: "To convince or persuade a man is largely a matter of identifying the opinion or course of action which you wish him to adopt with one or more of his fixed opinions or customary courses of action. When his mind is satisfied of the identity, then doubts vanish. . . ."[20] To support this position Winans quotes the following passage from Bain's book, *Senses and Intellect:* "Persuasion implies that some course of conduct shall be so described, or expressed, as to coincide, or be identified, with the active impulses of the persons addressed, and thereby command their adoption of it by the force of their own natural dispositions. . . . The fertile oratorical mind is one that can identify a case in hand with a great number of the strongest beliefs of an audience."[21] Winans makes the relationship between his theory of common ground and his use of the term identification explicit when he states: "It will be seen by the thoughtful that we are not so much putting forward a new principle in identification as seeking the advantage of another way of looking at what we have discussed under the head of common ground. . . ."[22]

Winans' use of the term "identification," which he equates with his theory of common ground, is clearly similar to Burke's.[23] The significant difference is the relative emphasis placed upon it; Winans makes it a means subordinate to his theory of attention, whereas Burke makes it the key term of his rhetoric.

In summary we may say Burke holds that a speaker persuades by using linguistic "strategies" which give "signs" to his hearers that his "properties" are similar to or identical with their "properties." This concept of identification as the means of achieving persuasion is based on his philosophical conception of "substance" as an "act" and the resulting possibilities for "consubstantiality." Burke's concept of identification is not new to American rhetoric. It is implicit in Phillips' principle of reference to experience and is explicit in Winans' common ground theory.

Burke's theory of rhetoric in terms of identification is not a "new" *rhetoric*; it is, rather, a "new" *perspective* from which to view the "old" rhetoric. Burke's approach is significant not because he regards identification as a means of achieving persuasion, but because he regards it as the *only* means of achieving persuasion. *A Rhetoric of Motives* provides the heretofore unexplored philosophical basis of this concept and is a challenge to the student of rhetoric. Those who read Burke must be prepared to get many echoes of classical doctrine, in which he is thoroughly read, but they will also find new terminology, new perspectives, and new dimensions.

[20] James Albert Winans, *Public Speaking* (New York, 1917), pp. 276-277.
[21] *Ibid.*, p. 278 (Bain, p. 542).
[22] *Ibid.*, p. 278.

[23] An interesting treatment of the "common ground" theory and Burke's identification theory is found in the second edition of Robert Oliver's *The Psychology of Persuasive Speech* (New York, 1957). See Chapter 8, "Identification."

AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF EVALUATION UPON GROUP BEHAVIOR

Alvin Goldberg

Introduction

VARIOUS educators, psychotherapists, social psychologists, and others interested in discussion and group processes have theorized about the effects of evaluation upon group behavior.[1] However, despite this theoretical concern with the problem, relatively few direct experimental investigations into the effects of evaluation have been reported.

There are a few empirical investigations. Lazarus, Deese, and Osler observed that verbal evaluations of a threatening nature reduced the effectiveness of military personnel engaged in a variety of physical tasks.[2] In a study of the development of interpersonal relationships, Newcomb found that individuals were attracted to those who evaluated them in a positive manner.[3] Raskin analyzed a number of client-centered therapy protocols, and discovered that when evaluations by the therapist were withheld, patients began to rely more upon their own self evaluations, and less upon the judgments of others.[4]

Insight into the problem of evaluation is provided by some studies that were primarily concerned with other variables. An investigation by Proshansky and Murphy into the effects of reward and punishment on perception, for example, suggests that evaluation has a measurable effect on the manner in which individuals perceive events.[5] A study by Deutsch offers some indirect evidence that the threat of external evaluation will cause a group to be less communicative, less friendly, and less coordinated than groups that are not so threatened.[6] Lanzetta and his associates found that groups that are highly threatened by evaluation are more concerned with acceptance, and less aggressive and autocratic than other groups.[7] Both Deutsch and Lanzetta, however, were concerned with the threat of evaluation and not with the effects of actually judging a group.

Mr. Goldberg is Assistant Professor of Speech, Northern Illinois University. The experiment here reported was conducted for a Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1959.

[1] For representative points of view, see Carl R. Rogers, *Client-Centered Therapy* (Boston, 1951); Thomas Gordon, *Group-Centered Leadership* (Boston, 1955); L. Festinger, "A Theory of Social Comparison Processes," *Human Relations,* VII (May 1954), 117-140; F. J. Roethlisberger, "Barriers to Communication," *Etc.*, IX (Winter 1952), 89; Nathaniel Cantor, *Dynamics of Learning* (Buffalo, 1946), p. 74.

[2] R. S. Lazarus, J. Deese, and S. Osler, "The Effects of Psychological Stress Upon Performance," *Psychological Bulletin,* XLIX (July 1952), 293-317.

[3] T. M. Newcomb, "The Prediction of Interpersonal Attraction," *American Psychologist,* XI (November 1956), 575-586.

[4] N. J. Raskin, "An Objective Study of the Locus of Evaluation Factor in Psychotherapy" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Psychology, University of Chicago, 1949).

[5] H. Proshansky and G. Murphy, "The Effects of Reward and Punishment on Perception," *Journal of Psychology,* XIII (April 1942), 295-305.

[6] M. Deutsch, "The Effects of Cooperation and Competition upon Group Process," *Human Relations,* II (November and September 1949), 129-152, 199-231.

[7] J. T. Lanzetta, D. Haefner, P. Langham, and H. Axelrod, "Some Effects of Situational Threat on Group Behavior," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* XLIX (July 1954), 445-453.

Torrance, Hochbaum, and Beier dealt more directly with the problem of evaluation. Torrance discovered that groups allowed to evaluate themselves became significantly more productive than groups evaluated by an external source.[8] A study by Hochbaum revealed that group members evaluated negatively by an authority figure were more likely to subsequently conform to group norms than group members an authority evaluated positively.[9] Beier concluded that individuals who were given either positive or negative interpretations of their Rorschach responses became more rigid in their problem solving and reasoning, and exhibited more anxiety and greater disorganization than they had prior to the evaluation.[10]

Studies by Gilchrist and by Berkowitz, Levy, and Harvey considered the effects of evaluations by an external agency upon group structure, cohesiveness, and motivation. Gilchrist found that group members evaluated positively by a competent observer became more attractive to other group members.[11] Berkowitz, Levy, and Harvey demonstrated that the effects of evaluation upon member attractiveness reported by Gilchrist are affected by the value group members place upon group effectiveness. They found that group members with low task motivation are less influenced by the evaluations of an external observer than highly motivated members.[12]

Although previous research has dealt with certain aspects of the problem of evaluation, little is known at present about the evaluative behavior of individuals who have been judged. In addition, the research literature provides very limited information about the effects of evaluation upon group interaction, or upon group performance. The general purpose of this investigation was to fill some of the gaps in our knowledge of the effects of certain types of evaluation upon some aspects of human behavior in groups. Specifically, this study attempted to determine: (1) if various kinds of evaluation have significant effects upon the manner in which individual group members subsequently evaluate each other; (2) the performance of groups under various conditions of evaluation; and (3) the influence of positive and negative judgments upon group interaction processes.

Method

Subjects. Two hundred fifty-eight undergraduates served as subjects in this study. They were recruited from introductory courses offered by Northwestern University's School of Speech. The subjects were divided into groups of three or four. A total of seventy-two groups participated in the investigation; forty-eight experimental groups and twenty-four control groups. There were four different experimental conditions and two control conditions. Twelve groups were employed in each condition. The specific experimental or control treatment received by any particular group was determined in a random manner.

[8] E. P. Torrance, "Methods of Conducting Critiques of Group Problem Solving Performance," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, XXXVII (October 1953), 394-398.

[9] G. M. Hochbaum, "Certain Personality Aspects and Pressures to Uniformity in a Social Group" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Psychology, University of Minnesota, 1953).

[10] E. G. Beier, "The Effect of Induced Anxiety on Flexibility of Intellectual Functioning," *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, LXV, No. 9, (Washington, D. C., 1951).

[11] J. C. Gilchrist, "The Formation of Social Groups under Conditions of Success and Failure," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XLVII (April 1952), 174-187.

[12] L. Berkowitz, B. I. Levy, and A. R. Harvey, "Effects of Performance Evaluations on Group Integration and Motivation," *Human Relations*, X (August 1957), 195-208.

Evaluation Form. A six item rating scale was developed for this study. It was based upon criteria suggested by McBurney and Hance for evaluating discussion performance.[13] The scale, referred to as an *evaluation form,* permitted a judgment of an individual's objectivity, friendliness, contribution to the progress of the group, verbal effectiveness, freedom from dogmatism, and contribution to group goals. By placing a series of check marks near the "excellent" side of each continuum on the scale for subjects who were to be evaluated positively, or near the "poor" side for participants who were to be given negative evaluations, the experimenter was able to provide the experimental subjects with controlled evaluations of their discussion behavior.

Conditions. There were four experimental conditions. Subjects in the *positive-internal* groups received favorable or positive evaluations on an evaluation form which they were led to believe had been prepared by the members of their group. Members of the twelve *negative-internal* groups received negative or unfavorable evaluations allegedly prepared by their fellow group members. *Positive-external* and *negative-external* group members were evaluated by the experimenter. Positive-external subjects received positive evaluations from the experimenter, and negative-external subjects were evaluated negatively.

Twelve *internal-control* groups and twelve *external-control* groups were also employed in the study. The members of the internal-control groups followed the same procedure as the positive-internal and negative-internal subjects, but they did not receive any evaluation forms from one another. Subjects in the external-control groups followed the same procedure as the positive-external and negative-external groups. However, they did not receive any evaluation forms from the experimenter.

Group Tasks. Every group met for two twenty-minute periods. The groups were given three problems to solve during each session. The first task of the first session and the first and third tasks of the second session were taken from an empathy test developed by Kerr and Speroff.[14] In task one of the first session the group was asked to decide how factory workers would rank a given set of musical categories. In problem two the subjects were asked to judge the case of a widow who was brought to court for stealing lace in order to make her thirteen-year-old daughter a graduation dress. The final task of the first session consisted of a short problem in mathematics.

At the beginning of the second session, the group members were required to rank fifteen magazines from the highest to lowest in paid circulation. In the second problem the subjects were asked to decide if it was appropriate for a promising young executive to play ball with his workers at a company picnic, and to drink beer with them afterwards. Finally, if the group members had time, they were to decide how a set of commonly annoying experiences would be ranked by people between the ages of twenty-five and thirty-nine.

Procedure

Each group first assembled in a university classroom. The experimenter then led the subjects to the experimental room and directed them to take seats around a table. On the table was an envelope containing the three first-ses-

[13] J. H. McBurney and K. G. Hance, *Discussion in Human Affairs* (New York, 1950), pp. 347-349.

[14] W. A. Kerr and B. J. Speroff, *The Empathy Test* (Chicago, 1956), Form A.

sion tasks. A set of directions instructed the subjects to start with problem one, and if there was time, to work problems two and three.

Upon entering the experimental setting with the subjects, the researcher turned on a tape recorder. If the group was either a positive-internal, negative-internal, or internal-control, the experimenter immediately left the room and observed the group through a one-way mirror. The experimenter remained in the experimental room during the entire first session for all positive-external, negative-external, and external-control groups.

At the end of twenty minutes, the experimenter interrupted the first session, isolated each participant in a small room, distributed evaluation forms, and asked each subject to evaluate the behavior of every other group member. Following this, the independent variable, an evaluation, was introduced for the positive-internal groups in this manner. The evaluation forms prepared by all positive-internal group members were collected, ostensibly divided, and each participant was allowed to see how the others evaluated him. The researcher, however, employing the experimental approach referred to as the method of "false reporting" by Festinger,[15] privately substituted a set of illegitimate forms he had secretly prepared while the first session was in progress. These forms contained a random series of check marks that the experimenter had placed to the right of the middle point on each continuum. In this manner, every positive-internal subject was led to believe that others in his group thought very highly of his discussion behavior.

[15] L. Festinger, "Laboratory Experiments," *Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences*, ed. Leon Festinger and Daniel Katz (New York, 1953), pp. 160-162.

Negative-internal subjects were also given a set of evaluations prepared by the experimenter in the manner described above. However, these forms contained an irregular series of check marks that were located to the left of the middle point on each continuum. Hence, the negative-internal subjects were led to believe that their fellow group members disliked their discussion behavior.

Positive-external and negative-external group members were evaluated by the experimenter. After the subjects evaluated each other, their evaluation forms were collected, and the experimenter gave each individaul subject an evaluation form he had prepared stating: "This form contains my personal evaluation of your discussion behavior during the first session." Ignoring the actual behavior of the various subjects, the experimenter evaluated each positive-external subject positively by providing him with a form that contained a series of check marks that were randomly placed to the right of the middle point on each continuum. The marks indicated that the experimenter felt that the subject made worthwhile contributions to group progress, was free from dogmatism, asked excellent questions, made positive comments, and the like. Similarly, by providing each negative-external group member with an evaluation form containing check marks on the left of each continuum, every negative-external subject was evaluated negatively by the experimenter.

While still isolated, each experimental subject was allowed to look over the evaluation forms he was given for about sixty seconds. The evaluations were then collected, and the experimenter quickly led the subjects back to the experimental room.

The external- and internal-control subjects were not shown any evaluations

before starting their second session. After the evaluation forms they had prepared were collected by the experimenter, the control subjects remained isolated for about sixty seconds. Then, like the experimental subjects, they were led back to the experimental setting.

All experimental and control groups followed a similar procedure from this point on. The subjects met for another twenty-minute tape recorded session. They found an envelope on the table containing three more tasks. The groups were all observed by the researcher through the one-way mirror. The experimenter, incidentally, observed negative-internal and negative-external subjects very carefully. He was prepared to interrupt immediately any session in which a subject seemed overly disturbed by the evaluations. It was never necessary to take this step, however.

At the end of the second session, the subjects were placed in isolation, given evaluation forms, and asked to evaluate their fellow members once again. These evaluations were subsequently collected, and each subject was given a written questionnaire to fill out. After completing the questionnaire, the subjects were informed about the purpose of the study, and all false impressions were rectified.

Results

Evaluation Form Findings. The effects of receiving various types of evaluations upon a subject's subsequent behavior as an evaluator were determined by comparing differences in his pre- and post-evaluation form responses. The ratings were quantified by dividing each continuum into five equal sections and numbering them from one to five. A single score was obtained for each subject representing the average change in his response to all six evaluation form items.[16] An analysis of variance was performed to determine if there were any significant differences between conditions in evaluation form responses. Table 1 contains the results of this analysis.

[16] The items were combined because a preliminary examination of the data revealed little difference between responses to individual items. Many subjects became either more or less severe as evaluators, and this change was generally reflected in all of their ratings.

TABLE 1

Analysis of Variance of the Evaluation Form Reponse of the Forty-Eight Experimental and Twenty-Four Control Groups

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Between conditions	2319.8708	5	463.9741	168.36
Within conditions	181.8938	66	2.7559	$p < .01$
	2501.7646	71		

TABLE 2

Differences Between First Sessions and Second Sessions in Average Evaluation Form Responses for Members of Experimental and Control Groups

Conditions	Mean Diff.	SD of M. Diff.*	t	p
Positive-Internal	1.1161	.0593	18.82	.01
Negative-Internal	—1.1179	.0707	15.81	.01
Positive-External	.9614	.0662	14.52	.01
Negative-External	—.5079	.0635	8.00	.01
Internal-control	.2118	.0668	3.17	.01
External-control	.1361	.0640	2.13	.05

*The variances for all six conditions were combined and tested for homogeneity. A Bartlett's test resulted in a Chi-square of 1.3608 indicating homogeneity of variance.

The F score reported in Table 1 is significant at the 1% level of confidence. The over-all differences between the six conditions in evaluation form response are greater than chance. A number of t-tests was performed to discover if all the observed pre- and post-evaluation form mean differences within each experimental and control condition were significant. The results of these tests are found in Table 2.

Table 2 reveals that a significant change occurred in the evaluative behavior of the various experimental and control groups. The within-group evaluation form mean differences were significant at the 1% level for the subjects in every experimental condition and for the internal-control subjects. The difference in the external-control group responses was significant at the 5% level. Positively evaluated subjects and non-evaluated control subjects re-evaluated others in a more positive manner, whereas negatively evaluated subjects became significantly more negative in their re-evalations.

Additional t-tests were conducted to determine the nature of the significant differences between conditions found by the analysis of variance summarized in Table 1. Changes within the experimental and control groups were also compared with one another. The results of these between-condition comparisons are reported in Table 3.

The findings reported in Table 3 indicate that the subjects in three of the four experimental conditions differed significantly from their controls in evaluation form response changes. Subjects who received what appeared to be positive evaluations from their fellow group members, or from the experimenter, re-evaluated their group members in a significantly more positive manner than control subjects who received no evaluations. The re-evaluations of subjects who were led to believe they were evaluated negatively by others in their group were significantly lower than control subject re-evaluations. This indicates that the substantial changes in evaluation form response exhibited by the positive-internal, positive-external, and negative-internal groups can be attributed to the independent variable. Subjects evaluated negatively by the experimenter did not differ in their evaluation form response changes from those who were not evaluated at all.

Task Performance. Data were collected and processed to determine if evaluation had an effect upon the amount of work accomplished by a group. A t of 3.93 at 11 df indicated that the negative-external subjects increased significantly (1% level) in the proportion of tasks completed from the first session to the second. However, a significant increase also occurred in the productivity of the external-control

TABLE 3

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE VARIOUS CONTROL AND EXPERIMENTAL CONDITIONS IN MEAN EVALUATION FORM RESPONSE CHANGE

Conditions Compared	t	df	p
Positive internal-Internal control	2.55	84	.05
Negative internal-Internal control	3.54	80	.01
Positive internal-Negative internal	6.09	86	.01
Positive external-External control	2.25	84	.05
Negative external-External control	1.75	87	N.S.
Positive external-Negative external	3.99	85	.01
Positive internal-Positive external	.43	86	N.S.
Negative internal-Negative external	1.61	85	N.S.
Internal control-External control	.21	82	N.S.

groups. Consequently, the change in the experimental condition cannot be attributed to the independent variable. An analysis of variance resulting in an F of 1.3438 at 5 and 66 df revealed that the change in productivity exhibited by the groups in any one condition did not differ significantly from the productivity changes that occurred in the other conditions.

the group was attempting to solve (T), or whether it was more concerned with the psychological aspects of the group's interaction (P). Mean changes in the ratio of process and task statements from first to second sessions in each condition were computed, and analyzed statistically. The results of an analysis of variance are presented in Table 4.

The F of 4.7699 reported in Table 4

TABLE 4

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE FIRST TO SECOND SESSION CHANGE IN PROCESS-TASK RATIOS EXHIBITED BY GROUPS IN EACH OF THE SIX CONDITIONS

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Between conditions	41.2980	5	8.2596	4.7699
Within conditions	116.0196	66	1.7316	$p < .01$
		71		

There were definite answers to two of the three problems the groups were asked to solve each session. The data were analyzed to discover if the experimental variable had any effect upon the ability of the groups to answer these problems correctly. An analysis of variance resulted in an F of .5680 at 5 and 48 df, indicating that the differences between conditions were not significant in this respect.

Content Analysis of the Protocols. The interaction of every group was tape recorded. Segments of these tapes were put into manuscript form and given to six experts in discussion, group processes, or related areas. The judges individually categorized the content of randomly selected portions of these first- and second-session protocols.[17] The method of analysis consisted of distinguishing between "task" and "process" statements. The judges placed a "T" or a "P" to the left of every sentence, indicating whether the remark dealt with the specific problem

is significant at the 1% level of confidence. Hence, the judges found a meaningful over-all difference between the control and experimental groups in the balance between process and task interactions. To determine the specific location of these differences, t-tests were performed. Significant *t* scores at the 1% level of 3.26 at 11 df and 4.68 at 11 df indicated that both positive-internal and negative-internal groups became significantly more process-centered after receiving positive or negative evaluations.[18] The group members became more concerned with the psychological aspects of their interaction than they were prior to the evaluations. Groups in the other conditions did not change significantly in this respect.

An additional content analysis of the positive-internal and negative-internal groups was performed by the experimenter, using the category system developed by Robert F. Bales.[19] The analysis indicated that both positive and negative internal evaluations stimulated

[17] The combined reliability of the six judges in categorizing the process and task contents of the protocols was .783. Reliability was determined by using the intraclass correlation technique developed by Ebel. See R. L. Ebel, "Estimation of the Reliability of Ratings," *Psychometrika*, XVI (December 1951), 407-424.

[18] The proportion of process remarks more than doubled from the first session to the second for both the positive-internal and negative-internal groups.

[19] Robert F. Bales, *Interaction Process Analysis* (Cambridge, Mass., 1950).

process interaction that was primarily positive in nature. That is, the group members joked and laughed a great deal, and their remarks showed solidarity and a willingness to accept the opinions and feelings of others. There was little disagreement, and few overt signs of antagonism. However, positively evaluated subjects were less hostile and defensive than group members who received negative evaluations from each other. When dealing with the task at hand, negative-internal subjects gave twice as many opinions and asked twice as many questions as the positive-internal subjects, but they suggested fewer answers to the questions that were raised.

Discussion

The evaluation form findings revealed that subjects who were evaluated positively by others in their group, re-evaluated their evaluators in a more positive manner. This offers support for Newcomb's hypothesis that individuals will tend to like those by whom they are liked, or those who describe them in most favorable terms.[20] Newcomb's hypothesis is not adequate, however, to explain all of the evaluation form changes that occurred. Additional hypotheses, which in a sense, are extensions of Newcomb's basic formulations, have been developed to account for the evaluation form results.

Since subjects who were evaluated negatively by others in their group were significantly more negative in their re-evaluations of their critics, it appears that the reverse of Newcomb's hypothesis is also valid: Individuals will tend to dislike those by whom they are disliked, or those who describe them in most unfavorable terms.

Subjects who were evaluated positively by the experimenter became more positive in their re-evaluations of their fellow group members. This suggests the hypothesis: Group members evaluated positively by an external observer will develop greater sentiments of liking toward others in their group.

Negative evaluations by the experimenter did not result in a change in evaluation form response. At first glance, this seems to contradict the findings of Berkowitz, Levy, and Harvey, who report that when all the members of a group receive negative evaluations from an external source, they respond by increasing their ratings of attractiveness of others in their group.[21] However, in the Berkowitz et al. investigation, the subjects were aware of the ratings received by their fellow group members. The subjects in the present study were acquainted only with the evaluations they themselves obtained. This suggests that group members evaluated negatively by an external source will not alter their sentiments toward others in their group if they are not aware of the evaluations received by other group members.

Although they did not change as much as positive-external and positive-internal groups, non-evaluated control groups also became significantly more positive in their re-evaluation of other group members. This can be explained by Homans' hypothesis that increased interaction between persons is accompanied by an increase of sentiments of liking among them.[22]

A content analysis revealed that group interaction became significantly more process centered when members received either positive or negative evalua-

[20] Newcomb, *op. cit.*, p. 581.

[21] Berkowitz, Levy, and Harvey, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

[22] George C. Homans, *The Human Group* (New York, 1950), p. 112.

tions from each other. Perhaps internal evaluations affect a group's interaction in this manner because they interfere so directly with a group's structure. Cartwright and Zander point out that some group members are attracted to high status positions and others prefer to be more centrally located.[23] Positive or negative evaluations by other group members could place individuals in status positions they do not find attractive, and if they therefore attempt to change their location in the group's structure, their group interaction will be more concerned with process matters than with the task at hand. This explanation is supported by a study by Kelley who found that individuals in unpleasant status positions are more likely to talk about things other than the group task.[24] Since external evaluations originate outside of the group, they are less threatening to group structure and consequently have less of an effect upon group interaction.

It is difficult to generalize about the effects of evaluation upon group productivity on the basis of this study. Evaluation did not seem to affect the productivity of a group as measured by the amount or quality of work accomplished during a twenty-minute session. However, a content analysis of the protocols indicated that group members who evaluated each other either positively or negatively became less concerned with task matters—at least verbally—than non-evaluated group members. Further investigation is needed to determine if the differences in process-task centeredness brought about by evaluation would ultimately affect group productivity.

[23] Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, *Group Dynamics: Research and Theory* (Evanston, Ill., 1953), p. 423.

[24] H. H. Kelley, "Communication in Experimentally Created Hierarchies," *Human Relations*, IV (1951), 39-56.

Summary

Seventy-two groups of three and four members each were assigned at random to one of six different conditions. All of the groups met for two twenty-minute sessions, and were provided with three problem solving tasks each meeting.

At the end of every session, the participants evaluated the discussion behavior of their fellow group members on an evaluation form. Prior to their second meeting, subjects in the positive-internal and negative-internal conditions were allowed to see how they had been evaluated. However, the evaluation forms were secretly changed by the experimenter. The subjects in the positive-internal condition were given the impression that they were evaluated positively. Negative-internal subjects were led to believe that they were evaluated negatively by others in their group.

Subjects in the positive-external condition received positive evaluations from the experimenter. The experimenter evaluated negative-external participants negatively. Internal and external control group subjects did not receive evaluations.

The statistically significant effects of the various experimental and control treatments can be summarized as follows:

(1) Subjects who were evaluated positively by their fellow group members re-evaluated the others in their group in a more positive manner; this change was greater than the changes exhibited by the internal and external controls, and the negative-internal and -external subjects. These positive-internal subjects also became significantly more process centered in their interaction during the second meeting.

(2) Subjects who were evaluated negatively by others in their group became

significantly more negative in their re-evaluation of their fellow group members; this change differed significantly from control subject and positive-internal subject re-evaluations. In addition, negatively evaluated subjects became significantly more process centered in their interaction during the second meeting.

(3) Group members evaluated positively by the experimenter re-evaluated their peers in a more positive manner; this change was greater than the change exhibited by the internal and external controls, and by the negative-internal and -external subjects. Positive-external subjects became significantly less process centered in their interaction during their second meeting than did the positive-internal subjects.

(4) Negative evaluations by the experimenter did not significantly affect the evaluative behavior of group members. The subjects did become significantly more task centered in their interaction during the second session than did the external control groups.

(5) Non-evaluated control subjects became more positive in their evaluations of their fellow group members; this change was not as great as the change in the same direction exhibited by positive-internal and positive-external subjects; it was significantly greater than the change in a negative direction provoked by negative-internal evaluations.

(6) Under the conditions of the experiment, evaluation did not affect group productivity.

GHOSTWRITING AND THE RHETORICAL CRITIC

Ernest G. Bormann

THE rhetorical critic has always been faced with the problems posed by the ghostwriter, but in the last thirty years the practice of specters composing has spread so rapidly that the critic of contemporary public address finds a ghost lurking somewhere in almost any research project he undertakes.

There are several reasons for the increase in ghostwriting. The practice finds a hospitable environment in our contemporary culture with its specialization and its growing corporate character. Bureaucracy breeds ghostwriting. The bureaucratic organization is essentially one of specialization, delegated authority, and committees. The leader has many demands on his time. Details are delegated to experts, and speech writing tends to become another delegated detail.

Concomitant with this specialization of function and delegation of authority, is the growth of the committee. The candidate speaks for the party, the president speaks for the corporation, the Secretary of State speaks for the State Department, but what he says is carefully determined within the organizational bureaucracy—usually in committee. The speaker does not speak for himself but for the corporation or bureaucracy.

This phenomenon can be traced through the executive departments of the Federal Government to the President himself. Since Franklin D. Roosevelt, the ghostwriting team has been an integral part of the White House Staff. The practice has now moved downward into the executive mansions of many of our states, and political candidates for state and national office have picked up the procedure. Professor Windes has given us a detailed account of this practice in his "Adlai E. Stevenson's Speech Staff in the 1956 Campaign" (*QJS*, February 1960). Many college presidents, leaders of industry and labor, also use the ghostwriting team.

The second reason for the growth of ghostwriting has been the development of the mass media. The major speech that will be reported throughout the state or nation, or, perhaps, throughout the world, needs careful preparation. Each word must be weighed and the viewpoints pooled when a speech is prepared. The organization is full of experts who expect to be, and usually are consulted when important statements are being drafted.

In contemporary history only a few statesmen, such as Churchill, Wilson, and Theodore Roosevelt, have had enough faith in their rhetorical skill to withstand, for the most part, the pressure of using ghostwriters. Indeed, so common is the practice today, that the first question a critic of contemporary public address ought to ask himself when he contemplates a research project is the same question the cynical contemporary audience probably asked when they heard the speech, namely, "I wonder who wrote that for him?" For the rhetorical critic this question is not an

Mr. Bormann is Assistant Professor of Speech, University of Minnesota. *This essay is the substance of remarks made at a panel on "Ghostwriting," SAA Washington meeting in December.*

expression of idle curiosity but an important criterion for evaluating the difficulty and worth of his project. In very practical fashion the question of who wrote the speech affects the development of any rhetorical criticism.

The critic must deal with all or part of the following materials: the ideas of the speaker as revealed in the speeches to be criticized, the organization of those ideas, the speaker's delivery of the speeches, and the style in which the ideas were expressed. Perhaps the structure of the speeches can be criticized without considering the influence of the ghost, but biographical details are usually necessary for making an analysis of a speaker's ideas, delivery, and style. The speaker's education, speech training, reading, the influence of parents, teachers, and colleagues—all of these aspects are often considered to give insight into or explain the speaker's rhetorical practices. The delivery of the speech is influenced by the speaker's preparation and it is within the analysis of speech preparation that the most careful research is required when ghostwriters are discovered.

The importance and complexity of the enterprise is illustrated by the analysis of Franklin D. Roosevelt's speech preparation, in Brandenburg and Braden's monograph in the third volume of *A History and Criticism of American Public Address*.[1] In the same volume Richard Murphy examined Theodore Roosevelt's speech preparation in 1,900 words, about one-eighth of his paper.[2] Because Theodore Roosevelt wrote his own speeches Murphy could concentrate on the way one man prepared speeches. Brandenburg and Braden's analysis required 6,000 words, a little more than one-fourth of their longer monograph. Their impressively detailed analysis indicates that various people contributed phrases, ideas, drafts of speeches, and that the procedure frequently varied from speech to speech so that the preparation of each speech posed a new research problem. This raised a host of questions of this order: Was the "quarantine" expression in Roosevelt's address of October 5, 1937 actually Roosevelt's, or Rosenman's, or Ickes'? Did Raymond Moley, Robert Sherwood, Judge Rosenman, or Charles Michelson prepare the first draft of Roosevelt's fireside chat, March 12, 1933? Who thought up the phrase, "Martin, Barton, and Fish"?

Indeed, the Brandenburg and Braden monograph indicates that when a ghost or a committee of ghosts is present, the preparation of the speech affects not only the delivery but the ideas within the speech and, most importantly, the style of the speech. Style is the most personal aspect of speechmaking. It is in this area that the ghost's influence is most destructive and subtle. Marie Hochmuth, in her introductory essay for the third volume of *A History and Criticism of American Public Address*, wrote, "If style is the man himself, then a close scrutiny of the details of style should tell us what manner of man is doing the speaking, and in what relationship he conceives himself to be with his audience."[3] Claude M. Feuss makes the same point in discussing presidential ghostwriters. A presidential statement, he writes, should "reveal the au-

[1] Earnest Brandenburg and Waldo Braden, "Franklin Delano Roosevelt," *History and Criticism of American Public Address*, III, ed. Marie Hochmuth (New York, 1955), 458-530.

[2] Richard Murphy, "Theodore Roosevelt," *ibid.*, pp. 313-364.

[3] Marie Hochmuth, "The Criticism of Rhetoric," *ibid.*, p. 21.

thor's true self, that indefinable quality which makes his words glow and shine."[4]

The ghostwriter understands the importance of using a style that is appropriate to the speaker. He makes every effort to adapt his language to the personality of his client. Judge Rosenman maintained that the presidential ghostwriters "came gradually and unconsciously to be able to imitate the President's style—some, of course, better than others."[5] Despite the best intentions, the ghost skillful enough to hide his own personality when he writes a speech, is rare indeed. Larston Farrar points out this difficulty by telling of a game that the insiders used to play in Washington, D. C.:

> They would take the *Congressional Record*, read the speeches by the many legislators, and mark down the names of the ghost-writers whom they could recognize merely by the verbiage employed. They could find, for instance, merely by tracing certain literary giveaways, apparent in every writer's work, that one writer would be ghosting speeches for as many as five or six different legislators.[6]

Pity the rhetorical critic who follows Miss Hochmuth's dictum and tries to "tell what manner of man is doing the speaking" by analyzing the style of these particular speeches. Robert Ray, from his experience of criticizing the committee-written speeches of Franklin Roosevelt and Thomas Dewey in the campaign of 1944, concluded that the manner of the ghosts must be known, too:

> The critic of contemporary presidential campaign speeches has the responsibility to investigate thoroughly the matter of authorship. In addition to the established canons of criticism it is incumbent upon the critic that he know the character of those who assist in speech preparation and, to the extent possible, the degree of their influence in the speech-making process.[7]

Not only is the problem of authorship central to the speech texts themselves, but insofar as the rhetorical critic utilizes the historical method, the ghostwriter poses a broader problem. Today it is common for ghosts to write memoirs, autobiographies, magazine articles, and even letters. If the critic is not careful he will be misled by ghostwriters in many aspects of his research. Ernest R. May makes the point a bit acidly in his article, "Ghostwriting and History," when he writes:

> In 1950, the Supreme Court ruled against the admissibility of ghost-written speeches and documents, describing ghost writing as "the custom of putting up decoy authors to impress the guileless." On evidence that courts reject, historians have to depend in their search for truth.[8]

To explain how the growing practice of ghostwriting not only makes rhetorical criticism more difficult, but how it may actually destroy criticism, it is necessary to examine the rationale for rhetorical criticism. There are essentially two schools of thought. The most influential viewpoint has been that a speech, to be adequately evaluated, must be viewed as an interaction of the speaker with his environment. This might be called the speaker-oriented rhetorical criticism, for the critic attempting to investigate a speech along these lines must have a thorough understanding of the man who wrote the speech in order to criticize the speech. To such a critic, textual authenticity is vital. Baird and Thonssen, who have developed this approach in their book, *Speech Criticism*, devote a chapter to

[4] Claude M. Feuss, "Ghosts in the White House," *American Heritage*, X (December 1958), 99.

[5] Samuel I. Rosenman, *Working with Roosevelt* (New York, 1952), p. 233.

[6] Larston D. Farrar, "Live Ghosts in Washington," *American Mercury*, LXXXIII (November 1956), 112.

[7] Robert Ray, "Ghostwriting in Presidential Campaigns," *Today's Speech*, IV (September 1956), 15.

[8] Ernest R. May, "Ghostwriting and History," *The American Scholar*, XXII (1953), 463.

the problems of textual authenticity. If the critic is going to emphasize the role of the speaker in the development of the speech, then it is crucial that he have the right man. This problem is illustrated by Richard Baker's study of the persuasive techniques of Benjamin F. Fairless. Baker discovered that from 1946 to 1950 Fairless's language was "poor," but in April, 1950, there was a "startling" improvement. Fairless became conversational and his language was simple, familiar, and easy to understand. It was in April, 1950, that Phelps Adams joined United States Steel's public relations firm and started assisting with Mr. Fairless's speeches.[9] If the ghost has contributed as substantially as Phelps Adams did in the drafting of a speech, it may, indeed, be that his speech training, education, hobbies, and reading habits should be examined as well as Mr. Fairless's. When an entire committee has written the speech, the problem of relevant biographical materials becomes so complex as to be almost impossible.

The second approach is that of the speech-oriented criticism. McBurney and Wrage represent this viewpoint in their book, *The Art of Good Speech*. They suggest that the artistic theory be used in speech criticism. This involves criticizing the speech by "the principles of the art."[10] On the surface, it would seem that concentrating on the artistry with which a given speech has been developed, might solve the critical problems posed by the ghostwritten speech. If the critic restricted his criticism to the speech, without examining biographical details of the men who wrote the speeches, then authorship would be relatively unimportant. If the King of England wanted a speech to explain to his people the reasons for his abdicating the throne and he could get Winston Churchill to help write the speech, then Edward's speech could be studied and criticized as good rhetoric even though he did not write it himself.

However, a criticism of the speeches of a junior Senator from a midwestern state on the soil bank, would be difficult to justify on artistic grounds. For that matter, it would be difficult to justify the criticism of the major speeches of the last two Presidents on such grounds. In short, the ghostwriter makes the artistic criticism of speeches difficult if not impossible, because there is very little that is artistically worth studying in his efforts. The reason for this is that the ghost, writing for someone else, tends not to write as well as he can. The ghost has a tendency to be discreet and careful. He weakens adjectives and tones down the strength of statements. He knows the punishment for a mistatement or a careless word. He weighs and ponders every expression, and as a result, he dilutes the distinctiveness and strength and spontaneity of whatever writing talent he may have.

In addition, few really important speeches are now the work of one personality. The trend is for a panel of ghosts to work in committee fashion. After members of the panel have discussed the goals and major ideas for the speech, they gather material, prepare a draft, and submit the draft to the committee for further discussion and a series of revisions. When the draft reaches a degree of perfection it is submitted to further screenings. A speech by a political figure may be looked over by someone representing the farm vote, by someone from labor, by a representative from the urban areas, and by someone with an eye for various religious and minority groups. After the rough edges that

[9] *SM*, XXVI (1959), 100.

[10] James H. McBurney and Ernest J. Wrage, *The Art of Good Speech* (New York, 1953), pp. 22-23.

might irritate any political pressure group have been sanded smooth, the committee polishes the document and the chairman reads it as his own.

What emerges from this process, no matter how talented the individual writers are, is a sort of grammatically correct, innocuous prose, not well suited for artistic criticism. Robert Sherwood, no stranger to the speech-writing committee, made this point in discussing a speech of Harry Hopkins:

> It was too carefully prepared, too meticulously conciliatory to all groups, to be a characteristic expression of Hopkins himself. It was the kind of speech which appeared to have been written by a large committee rather than by the individual speaker; it was synthetic, characterless.[11]

Like the slick six-author movies of a few years ago, a committee writes a speech that tends to be slick, commercial, and lacking in individuality. Style may be the man, but when that style is five men, it ceases to be any style at all. Since current ghostwriting practices militate against producing an effective speech, or an artistic one, they undercut the rhetorical critic no matter what his standards of criticism may be.

Under the impetus of the ghostwriter, American public address moves more and more in the direction of the rhetoric of the second Sophistic. It becomes a ritual, or an exhibition, produced at the expected time. As the public becomes more and more cynical about the authorship of speeches, the ethos of the speaker is undermined; the speech loses its hold upon the public as a vital factor in public affairs. The level of rhetoric declines and its function as a fundamental tool for the winnowing of ideas in a democratic society is lost. With this decline, the justification for rhetorical criticism declines as well.

[11] Robert E. Sherwood, *Roosevelt and Hopkins* (New York, 1949), p. 111.

LOGAN'S ORATION—HOW AUTHENTIC?

Ray H. Sandefur

I appeal to the white man ungrateful to say,
If he e'er from my Cabin went hungry away?
If naked and cold unto Logan he came,
And he gave him no blanket, and kindled no flame?

—JOHN J. JACOB

JUST off Ohio-U. S. Highway 23 between Circleville and Chillicothe stands an ancient twisted elm which marks the site where one of the most curious speeches in American history was delivered. In the autumn of 1774, sitting on a log beneath the branches of the tree which was to become known as "Logan's Elm," the Mingo Indian Chief John Logan spoke a brief melancholy message, whose haunting eloquence was destined to place the speech among the great orations of all times.

Although widely reported in 1775 in magazines and newspapers here and abroad, the speech might have long since been forgotten had it not been for an odd set of circumstances resulting in a controversy over the authenticity of the speech and involving no less a person than Thomas Jefferson as the central figure.

It was Jefferson's report of Logan's speech in his *Notes on Virginia*, printed privately in Paris in 1784, which rescued the oration from obscurity and set off an argument lasting over a century. Jefferson presented the oration as an example of the "genius and mental powers" of the American Indians and their use of speech as a means of "personal influence and persuasion:"

> Of their eminence in oratory we have fewer examples, because it is displayed chiefly in their own councils. Some, however, we have, of very superior lustre. I may challenge the whole orations of Demosthenes and Cicero, and of any more eminent orator, if Europe has furnishd more eminent, to produce a single passage, superior to the speech of Logan, a Mingo chief, to Lord Dunmore, then Governor of this state.[1]

Jefferson's publication of the speech aroused no comment until 1797, when a Mr. James Fennel, an "elocutionist," recited the version to an audience in Philadelphia. Luther Martin, an ardent political foe of Jefferson, took exception to the speech and charged publicly that no such Indian oration had ever been given.[2]

Stung by the charge, Jefferson countered by presenting in his 1801 edition of *Notes on Virginia* twenty-three pages of affidavits from persons who testified to the accuracy of the speech.[3] Jefferson's defense seemed only to add fuel to the flame, and the arguments increased in vigor. In 1826, the year of Jefferson's death, John J. Jacob expressed regret that Jefferson could not further defend himself, but he felt that he must expose and refute the "detestable" speech as a "mere counterfeit."[4] Taking an opposite view, Caleb Atwater in 1838 in his *History of the State of Ohio* affirmed his belief in the speech

Mr. Sandefur is Professor of Speech, and Head of the Department of Speech, University of Akron.

1 *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, ed. Albert Ellery Bergh (Washington, D. C., 1907), II, 87-88.

2 *The Olden Time* (February 1847), II, 51.

3 *Writings of Jefferson*, II, 91, 305-324.

4 John J. Jacob, *Captain Michael Cresap* (Cumberland, Md., 1826), p. 129.

and referred to its "heart stirring eloquence."[5] In a blistering address delivered before the Maryland Historical Society, May 9, 1851, Brantz Mayer asserted that although Logan may have said *something*, there was no "speech" as reported by Jefferson.[6] On the other hand, in 1866 Logan's words appeared in *McGuffey's Fifth Eclectic Reader*[7] as an example of authentic American Indian oratory worthy of study and memorization. As late as 1890, R. H. Taneyhill in the *History of the Upper Ohio Valley* cast doubt on the accuracy of Jefferson's account of the speech.[8] In contrast, in 1892 Captain Alfred Lee, in a history of Columbus, Ohio, expressed his belief in the authenticity of the speech and noted its "striking resemblance" to Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.[9] Even Theodore Roosevelt became interested in the controversy and devoted five pages of his *Winning of the West* to a discussion of the genuineness of Logan's oration.[10]

In the twentieth century the speech continues to appear in collections of orations. As recently as 1958, under the dateline of May 4, it was reprinted in the Cleveland *Plain Dealer*. Houston Peterson opens his *A Treasury of the World's Great Speeches* with Logan's oration, pointing out that the origins of eloquent speech are lost in the mists of antiquity, but that "the so-called primitive or nonliterate people who still survive give us some hint of the earliest stages of eloquence."[11] He then presents Logan's speech as a "sample of this eloquence," although cautioning that its accuracy is questioned.

The intriguing question remains of how authentic Logan's oration is. To understand all the circumstances, one must turn first to the background of the occasion on which the speech was reportedly given. On April 30, 1774, according to some accounts, a group of British soldiers had, allegedly without provocation, murdered a number of Indians in Joshua Baker's trading store, located about fifteen miles above Steubenville, Ohio. Logan was convinced that Captain Michael Cresap had been in command of the men at that time. (Apparently he was wrong; Captain Daniel Greathouse is presumed to have been in command.) Among those killed were Logan's sister and brother. As a result of these murders, the Mingo chief turned from friendship for the whites to an implacable enmity. It is said that Logan in his vengeance took at least thirty scalps from the "paleface" pioneers.

Later that year Lord Dunmore, royal governor of Virginia, traveled with part of the Virginian army through the wilderness westward into the Scioto Valley in hope of establishing a treaty of reconciliation with the Indians, particularly with the hostile Logan. Dunmore and his men encamped on the Pickaway Plains near Chillicothe, Ohio. When Dunmore met with the assembled Indian representatives, Chief Logan was noticeably absent. The British needed Logan's concurrence, of course, if the treaty were to be realized. The governor therefore sent frontier veteran John Gibson (whose Indian wife was among those murdered at Baker's and was

[5] Caleb Atwater, *History of the State of Ohio* (Cincinnati, 1838), p. 116.

[6] Brantz Mayer, *Tah-Gah-Jute or Logan and Captain Michael Cresap* (Baltimore, 1851), p. 61.

[7] William H. McGuffey, *McGuffey's Fifth Eclectic Reader* (New York, 1866), p. 324.

[8] R. H. Taneyhill, "History of Jefferson County Ohio," *History of the Upper Ohio Valley* (Madison, 1890), II, 43.

[9] Alfred E. Lee, *History of the City of Columbus* (New York, 1892), I, 97.

[10] Theodore Roosevelt, *The Winning of the West* (New York, 1889-1896). *The Works of Theodore Roosevelt*, National Edition, ed. Hermann Hagedorn (New York, 1927), VIII, 193-195; 203-207.

[11] Houston Peterson, *A Treasury of the World's Great Speeches* (New York, 1954), p. 1.

Logan's sister) to urge the Mingo chief to attend the council. There has been sharp disagreement as to what happened next. The generally reported account is that Gibson met with Logan, and that Logan invited him and several Indian chiefs to walk with him into a woods. There sitting on a log under an elm, the Mingo chief burst forth in an impassioned speech, which was neither a message of peace nor an admission of defeat. It was, instead, an oddly pathetic recital of his wrongs and a strange justification of his bloody vengeance.

There appear to be three principal English versions of this speech, Jefferson's, and those in two letters published in the *American Archives* in 1837. One letter recorded in the *Archives*, with the writer and receiver unidentified, was written in Williamsburg, Virginia, February 4, 1775. This version may also be the one reported to have appeared in Dixon and Hunter's *Virginia Gazette* of that same date under a Williamsburg head.[12] This text follows:

I appeal to any white man to say that he ever entered Logan's cabin but I gave him meat; that he ever came naked but I clothed him. In the course of the last war *Logan* remained in his cabin, an advocate for peace. I had such an affection for the white people that I was pointed at by the rest of my Nation. I should have lived with them had it not been for Colonel *Cresap*, who last year cut off, in cold blood, all the relations of *Logan*, not sparing women and children. There runs not a drop of my blood in the veins of any human creature. This called upon me for revenge; I have sought it—I have killed many, and fully glutted my revenge. I am glad that there is a prospect of peace, on account of the Nation; but I beg you will not entertain a thought that any thing I have said proceeds from fear! *Logan* disdains the thought! He will not turn on his heel to save his life! Who is there to mourn for *Logan*? No one.[13]

[12] *Writings of Jefferson*, II, 319.

[13] *American Archives*, Fourth Series (Washington, D. C., December, 1837), p. 1020.

The second letter in the *Archives*, also with writer and receiver unidentified, was written in Virginia and published in New York, February 16, 1775. The letter opens, "I make no doubt but the following specimen of Indian eloquence and mistaken valor will please you; but you must make allowances for the unskillfulness of the Interpreter."[14] Although the report of the Logan speech which then follows in the letter differs slightly from both the version in the February 4 letter and Jefferson's account, stylistically it is nearer Jefferson's and therefore need not be reproduced here in full. A few selected phrases will be given later for comparison.

The Jefferson version has been most widely reprinted and popularly accepted, and appears on the monument at the site of Logan's Elm. Here is Jefferson's text:

I appeal to any white man to say, if ever he entered Logan's cabin hungry, and he gave him not meat; if ever he came cold and naked, and he clothed him not. During the course of the last long and bloody war Logan remained idle in his cabin, an advocate for peace. Such was my love for the whites, that my countrymen pointed as they passed, and said, "Logan is the friend of white men." I had even thought to have lived with you, but for the injuries of one man. Colonel Cresap, the last spring, in cold blood, and unprovoked, murdered all the relations of Logan, not even sparing my women and children. There runs not a drop of my blood in the veins of any living creature. This called upon me for revenge. I have sought it: I have killed many: I have fully glutted my vengeance: for my country I rejoice at the beams of peace. But do not harbor a thought that mine is the joy of fear. Logan never felt fear. He will not turn on his heel to save his life. Who is there to mourn for Logan? Not one.[15]

In comparing the three versions, note these slight variations of phrases:

Feb. 4: ". . . but I gave him meat."

Feb. 16: ". . . and I gave him not meat."

Jefferson: ". . . and he gave him not meat."

[14] *Ibid.*

[15] *Writings of Jefferson*, II, 89.

Feb. 4: ". . . that he ever came naked but I clothed him."

Feb. 16: ". . . if ever he came cold or naked and I gave him not clothing."

Jefferson: ". . . if ever he came cold and naked, and he clothed him not."

Feb. 4: ". . . *Logan* remained in his cabin."

Feb. 16: ". . . *Logan* remained in his tent."

Jefferson: ". . . Logan remained idle in his cabin."

Observe the variations between the February 4 and February 16 versions in the following phrases, and note the similarities between the February 16 text and Jefferson's:

Feb. 4: "I had such affection for the white people, that I was pointed at by the rest of my Nation."

Feb. 16: ". . . nay, such was my love for the whites, that those of my own country pointed at me as they passed by, and said, 'Logan is the friend of white men.' "

Jefferson: "Such was my love for the whites, that my countrymen pointed as they passed, and said, 'Logan is the friend of white men.' "

Feb. 4: "I am glad that there is a prospect of peace, on account of the Nation."

Feb. 16: "For my country I rejoice at the beams of peace."

Jefferson: ". . . for my country I rejoice at the beams of peace."

Feb. 4: ". . . but I beg you will not entertain a thought that any thing I have said proceeds from fear! Logan disdains the thought!"

Feb. 16: ". . . but do not harbour the thought that mine is the joy of fear. Logan never felt fear."

Jefferson: "But do not harbor a thought that mine is the joy of fear. Logan never felt fear."

Neville B. Craig, editor of *The Olden Time* magazine, in the February, 1847, issue of that publication, said that the New York version (February 16) "is the copy reproduced in Jefferson's Notes,"[16] in spite of slight variations between the two. There can be little doubt that Jefferson's version either actually was the New York text with minor alterations of his own, or else his source was so like the New York copy as to be practically the same. Craig was not sure, however, whether Jefferson's or the Williamsburg version of February 4 was the authentic copy. He questioned the Williamsburg text because it contained the phrase, "who last *year* cut off in cold blood," which would have put the murders in an incorrect year, 1773. Yet, that version was "the first published, so far as we can find."[17] Jefferson said that his text of the speech, appearing in his personal notebook in his own handwriting, he had learned in Williamsburg—he "believed at Lord Dunmore's."[18]

Pointing up the uncertainty, Craig raised a question:

> How did it happen that the less elegant and correct copy should be the first published, and that too at the residence of Dunmore? Which was the copy that Gibson speaks about? Who prepared the spurious one?[19]

The controversy over the authenticity of Logan's speech and of Jefferson's account of the speech was first pressed by Luther Martin, son-in-law of Michael Cresap. Upon learning of Fennel's public rendition of the Jefferson version and angered by the reference to Cresap, in an open letter to Fennel, dated March 29, 1797, and appearing in the *Philadelphia Gazette,* Martin bitterly asserted that not only was the charge against Cresap false, but also that "no such specimen of Indian oratory was ever exhibited."[20] Said Martin sarcastically:

> In what wilderness Mr. Jefferson culled this fair flower of aboriginal eloquence; whether he had preserved it in the same state in which he found it, or, by transplanting it into a more

[16] *The Olden Time,* II, 66.

[17] *Ibid.*

[18] Henry S. Randall, *Life of Jefferson* (New York, 1858), I, 104. Randall says that in 1851 he personally saw the Jefferson notebook containing the Logan oration. The notebook was in the possession of Col. Thomas J. Randolph, Jefferson's oldest grandson.

[19] *The Olden Time,* II, 67.

[20] *Ibid.,* 51.

genial soil, given it the embellishments of cultivation, I know not.[21]

Furious at Martin's implication that he had fictitiously created the speech, Jefferson, in an open letter to Governor Henry of Maryland, dated December 31, 1797, and published as a footnote in the 1801 edition of his *Notes on Virginia*, sharply stated:

> General Gibson had been the translator of the speech. I wrote to him immediately. He, in answer, declared to me . . . that it was his translation I had used, with only two or three verbal variations of no importance. . . . It establishes unquestionably, that the speech of Logan is genuine; and that being established, it is Logan himself who is the author of all the important facts.[22]

In fuller expansion of his defense, Jefferson pointed out that for twenty-three years the speech as printed had gone unchallenged, that not until 1797 had there come the charge that the reported occasion was false and that the speech was a forgery created to "aid me in proving that the man of America was equal in body and mind to the man in Europe." But, said Jefferson as an aside, whether Logan's or his, the speech was by an American in any event. He then concluded, "He would have just right to be proud who could claim that composition. But it is none of mine; and I yield it to whom it is due."[23] In further support of the authenticity of the speech text, Jefferson obtained letters and affidavits from at least eighteen persons who could testify that the reports of the occasion and of the speech itself were reasonably accurate. Judge Henry Innes, for example, writing from Frankfort, Kentucky, on March 2, 1799, refuted the charge of forgery by declaring that he had seen a copy of Logan's speech in the "public prints" in 1775.[24] In an affidavit dated April 4, 1800, John Gibson himself stated that Logan had asked him to walk out with him, that they had gone into a copse of wood, where Logan, "after shedding abundance of tears," had delivered to him "the speech nearly as related by Mr. Jefferson."[25] He said further that he had made a "literal translation or transcription"[26] of Logan's words.

George Rogers Clark, who had been present in Dunmore's camp when the speech was read, declared, "Logan's speech to Dunmore now came forward as related by Mr. Jefferson and was generally believed and indeed not doubted to have been genuine and dictated by Logan."[27] The Rev. David Ziesberger, a Moravian missionary, who in 1772 had established a Moravian settlement at Schoenbrunn in Tuscarawas County, Ohio, had known Logan personally. He testified that he "doubted not in the least" that Logan had sent such a speech to Lord Dunmore, that expressions of this kind from the Indians were familiar to him, and that "Logan was capable of such eloquence."[28] With the support of this and similar evidence, Jefferson finally rested his case by asserting, "Of the genuineness of the speech nothing [more] need be said."[29]

There remained those, however, who felt that there was much more to be said. Simon Kenton, for instance, an Ohio woodsman who knew Logan and had been present at the treaty negotiations, doubted the existence of the oration. He said that he had "never heard of such a speech" until months later, that he was "positive no such speech

[21] *Ibid.*, 53.
[22] *Writings of Jefferson*, II, 91.
[23] *Ibid.*, 305.
[24] *Ibid.*, 307.
[25] *Ibid.*, 309.
[26] Roosevelt, p. 194.
[27] William Hayden English, *Conquest of the Northwest and Life of George Rogers Clark* (Indianapolis, 1896), p. 1033.
[28] *Writings of Jefferson*, II, 324.
[29] *Ibid.*, 325.

was made."[30] Benjamin Tomlinson, who also had been present at the treaty proceedings, recalled the speech:

> [Gibson] drew out of his pocket a piece of clean new paper, on which was written in his own handwriting—a speech for and in the name of Logan. This I heard read three times, once by Gibson, and twice by Dunmore; the purport of which was, that he (Logan) was the white man's friend, that . . . all his friends were killed at Yellow Creek, that now when he died who would bury him, for the blood of Logan was running in no creature's veins. . . .[31]

But Tomlinson complicated matters by asserting that Simon Girty, not Gibson, had been sent to Logan, that Girty had returned with the speech and related it to Gibson, who then gave a translation for Dunmore.[32] Jefferson consistently maintained, nevertheless, that Gibson was the "very person sent by Lord Dunmore to the Indian town"; that after he had delivered his message there, Logan took him out to a neighboring wood, sat down with him, and "rehearsing with tears, the catastrophe of his family," gave in his Indian tongue "that speech for Lord Dunmore," that Gibson carried it to Lord Dunmore and translated it for him,[33] "unquestionably preserving," insisted Jefferson, "its spirit and form in a most successful degree."[34]

Others bluntly voiced their doubts concerning Logan's speech. John J. Jacob, in his partisan biography of Cresap, in 1826, made a wavering denial:

> . . . Logan never made any speech at all and if he did he told an absurd, willful and wicked lie. But we say he never made any speech—at least, not the speech in question. . . .[35]

Jacob advanced arguments to prove that Cresap had nothing to do with the murders at Baker's store, and denounced the speech as a forgery:

> I have . . . exposed and refuted the famous Logan speech, and proved by the most respectable and indisputable testimony that it is a mere counterfeit; and even that counterfeit, false as it is, is still more base and detestable from the malignant interpolation foisted in, to serve no earthly purpose but to blacken the character of a most valuable and distinguished citizen [Cresap].[36]

Equally vigorous in his charges against the oration, Brantz Mayer, another defender of Cresap, denounced the speech text:

> The Virginia announcement [of the Williamsburg version of February 4, 1775] states it to be only a *"message"* which was *"said to have been"* sent by *Captain* Logan, (who was known as a Mingo), to Lord Dunmore. The New York copy, during the transit from Virginia, is magnified into a SPEECH, and dignifies the orator as a "SHAWNEE CHIEF!" Nor has the language of the document deteriorated by its travel northward. The Indian abruptness and directness has been softened by the journey. . . . The next member of this eloquent lineage blooms in mature perfection [in Jefferson's version].[37]

Mayer gave what he claimed to be the true account of the speech occasion:

> [Gibson found Logan] some miles off at a hut with several Indians; and, pretending in the Indian fashion, that he had nothing in view, talked and drank with them until Logan touched his coat stealthily, and, beckoning him out of the house, led him out into a solitary thicket, where sitting down on a log, he burst into tears and uttered some sentences of impassioned eloquence, which Gibson,—immediately returning to the British camp—committed to paper. As soon as the envoy had reduced the message to writing, it was read aloud in the council; heard by the soldiers; and proves to be neither a speech, a message, nor a pledge of peace.[38]

[30] Joseph Sullivant in a speech to the Franklin County Pioneers association in 1871. Sullivant as a boy knew Kenton and heard him express this doubt concerning Logan's speech. Lee, *loc. cit.*

[31] *The Olden Time*, II, 62.

[32] *Ibid.*, 63.

[33] *Writings of Jefferson*, II, 91.

[34] *Ibid.*, 111.

[35] Jacob, p. 94.

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 129.

[37] Mayer, p. 85.

[38] *Ibid.*, pp. 60, 61.

Mayer then concluded tartly, "Thus the famous 'speech of Logan' which has been so long celebrated as the finest specimen of Indian eloquence, dwindles into a reported conversation with, or message from, a blood-stained savage; excited perhaps when he delivered it as well by the cruelties he had committed as by liquor; false in its allegations as to Cresap; and, at last, after being conveyed to camp, six miles distant, in the memory of an Indian trader, written down, and read by proxy to the council of Lord Dunmore!"[39]

In 1890 R. H. Taneyhill resurrected the argument by asserting that the version of February 4, 1775, was the correct reproduction of the original manuscript. He thought Jefferson had embellished it:

> Over a hundred years have passed since this speech was translated into every leading language of Christendom, and now it is everywhere regarded as a gem of oratory. But the speech as so translated and as so highly esteemed for its oratory, is not after all the speech of Logan—it is simply Mr. Jefferson's version of it. That great man in his effort to add to its beauty, has broken its fair proportions, and in trying to purify its diction, has lessened its sublimity and force. And if we had only his version of the speech, criticism and candor would force us to say, too much polish for an Indian orator. Mr. Jefferson should have kept in mind what he well knew, that oratory is a native product and cannot be tampered with.[40]

Taneyhill then reproduced the Williamsburg version of February 4 and called attention to the similarity of language between the speech and a letter, accepted by some historians as authentic, which Logan presumably had dictated on July 21, 1774, to be taken to Captain Cresap before the occasion of the famous speech. This is the letter:

> Captain Cresap: What did you kill my people in Yellow Creek for? The white people killed my kin at Conestoga a great while ago, and I thought nothing of that, but you killed my kin again on Yellow Creek and took my cousin prisoner. Then I thought I must kill too; and I have been three times at war since; but the Indians are not mad, only myself.
>
> Captain John Logan.[41]

It was Taneyhill's contention that the style of the Williamsburg speech and the letter were similar, but that Jefferson's version was clearly different. He said that Jefferson's text was made "stiff and unwieldy by a too rigid adherence to old-time grammatical nicety."[42] He objected in particular to Jefferson's "beams of peace" and "never felt fear" as instances of "silly bravado."[43] One must note, however, that those phrases appear in the New York version and therefore pre-date the Jefferson text.

In evaluating the controversy over the genuineness of Logan's speech, it is obvious that many who questioned the very existence of any such oration did so with singularly little reason. Although there is no doubt that Logan was incorrect in naming Cresap as the perpetrator of the massacre, Cresap's defenders apparently felt it necessary not only to show the inaccuracy but to go to the extreme of maintaining that there had been no speech at all. Evidence establishes that there was indeed a speech.

A second point concerns John Gibson. Did he actually hear Logan's speech, and did he make an accurate translation? Here one must rely upon the reported integrity of the man. Authorities from Jefferson to Roosevelt defended Gibson as having a sound reputation for honesty. Furthermore, Gibson had no apparent motive for fabricating the speech. If one accepts the truthfulness of Gibson, he has what

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 61.
[40] Taneyhill, p. 43.
[41] *Ibid.*, p. 42. Other versions contain the word "angry" instead of "mad."
[42] *Ibid.*, p. 44.
[43] *Ibid.*, p. 45.

Roosevelt called the "keystone of the arch" in substantiating the speech.[44]

As to the report of the delivery of the translated speech to Lord Dunmore, George Rogers Clark's testimony is strongest, although here again one must trust the integrity of the man. Other charges against the speech were mainly conjectures and innuendoes without any proof behind them and can be dismissed as of little importance.

As to the question of which text is nearest to Logan's original words, one may only speculate. While it appears impossible to say which translated version most accurately reflects the original speech, perhaps the best position on the question of the oration's authenticity is that taken by Theodore Roosevelt. In his *Winning of the West,* after carefully weighing the evidence pro and con, Roosevelt was sufficiently convinced of the validity of the oration to declare, "Logan's speech can be unhesitatingly pronounced authentic. Doubtless there have been verbal alterations in it; there is not extant a report of any famous speech which does not probably differ in some way from the words as they were actually spoken."[45]

In summary, the evidence supports these points: (1) Logan did indeed dictate a speech to be taken to Lord Dunmore; (2) the speech was probably as accurately reported as any speech given in similar circumstances could be; (3) Jefferson's text very likely was taken from the New York version; (4) although the principal English texts vary in language, the emotion, feeling, sentiment, and thought in the three versions are virtually identical. Within the limitations discussed, then, and without labelling any one translation as the "correct" one, Logan's oration as reflected in the three versions can be assayed as authentic.

[44] Roosevelt, p. 204.

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 207.

MILTON'S RHETORICAL EXERCISES

Donald Lemen Clark

THE most important thing to remember about John Milton's rhetorical exercises, which he did while a student at Christ's College, Cambridge, is that they were composed to be spoken aloud to an audience. His habit of composing themes to be spoken rather than read was very important in influencing the adult prose which Milton wrote later in life. Of course the elementary exercises were in Latin, and as he matured Milton frequently changed to English, but the habit of writing with one eye on an audience and the other perhaps on a printer never left him and never ceased to leave its mark on his composition.

The themes were argumentative and appropriately designated as "disputations." The speakers would argue one side or another on a general theme or thesis. All seven of Milton's preserved exercises are theses. In them he argues "Whether day is superior to night," or "Whether ignorance is superior to learning." They were composed in Latin, passed under the tutor's eye, and delivered publicly before an academic audience in the college hall or in the schools of Cambridge University. The arguments were primarily syllogistic, and were presented in the form of syllogisms or enthymemes. All the arguments had to be presented in Aristotelian logic. These arguments were spoken of as scholastic; so Milton was able to write two theses against scholastic philosophy, in which he embodied his arguments in accurate scholastic form. Perhaps he got tired of following strict scholastic arguments in his theses, but he was very good at it, and could take pride in his accomplishments. The arguments were presented with a wealth of rhetorical adornment and graceful allusion. Milton probably preferred rhetorical over logical aspects in his exercises.

An analysis of one exercise, the sixth of his prolusions, and a study of its relation to similar contemporary exercises will reveal much of what Milton did in his rhetorical training. This exercise has an added interest, for it involves a great deal of fun-making and funning. Facetiousness can be found in all early seventeenth-century academic oratory; this concentration in Milton's exercise is not exceptional.

"Prolusion Sixth"[1] is made up of three parts. First (in Latin) is a more or less serious praise of folly. This may be called the *oration*. The second part (also in Latin), which may be called the exercise (*prolusion* proper), exhibits folly, and the third part gives the English verses, "At a Vacation Exercise in the Colledge."

The oration has the following rhetorical structure. First is the *Exordium*,

Mr. Clark is Professor Emeritus of Rhetoric, Columbia University. His many studies in rhetoric and literature include Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance *(1922),* Milton at St. Paul's School *(1948),* Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education *(1957), and previous articles in QJS.* *This paper is a revision of one read in absentia at the SAA 1959 Convention in Washington, D. C.*

[1] "The Prolusions of John Milton," ed. Donald Lemen Clark with a translation by Bromley Smith, in *The Works of John Milton* (New York, 1936), XII, 204-46. For the third part (English verses), see I, 19-22.

which expresses the character of the speaker and refers respectfully to the nature of the audience. Milton says in effect, "I respond to the courtesy and applause from those who had been formerly hostile to me." He continues with a burlesque and hyperbolic praise of the audience—its size, its importance, and the dignity of the participants. This burlesque part should not be taken seriously at all. He continues to refer to his excessive desire to please this distinguished audience in spite of his limited ability in being witty. The *Proposition* of the oration is, "I am about to speak seriously in praise of jocularity." The *Proof* proceeds by enthymemes and is an exercise of wit. He explains that this exercise of wit strengthens the mind as wrestling strengthens the body. He gives examples from historical and literary sources to show that this exercise is exceedingly valuable. He closes the oration with a *Peroration*, which concludes with, ". . . if I speak anything loosely or licentiously it is not in my disposition;" but the fact that he did so speak is indicated by Mrs. Tillyard's original translation which retains the scurrilous and indecent remarks in the decent obscurity of the learned language —Latin.[2]

The punning about father and his sons in Milton's "Prolusion" has its ultimate origin in the habits of the commencement exercises at the beginning of July in St. Mary's Church. The Professor or Fellow who was presenting and sponsoring the Master of Arts candidates and more advanced candidates for degrees was called the Father. The commencing candidates were called his sons, and his oldest son would be the senior brother who was a candidate for the Master's Degree. Of course, the sons introduced by Milton in his "Prolusion" and for whom he stood as Father were not preparing to take their degrees of M.A. at the University commencement; consequently Milton's speech was a burlesque of commencement procedure. Moreover, Milton's speech was not a prevarication, as has been said it was, but it owes something to the prevarications of commencement time in his facetiousness and tendency to skate on the edge of decency in its expression.

Let us now look at the actual commencement procedure to see what was being burlesqued. According to the OED, at Cambridge University the prevaricator was "an orator who made a jocose or satirical speech at commencement, called also varier, applied to a corresponding terrae filius at Oxford." As the prevaricator was required to make his speech on the same subject as indicated by the thesis which was debated seriously by the disputants at commencement, he furnished a welcome variation by introducing an element of humor and wit into what otherwise might be a very solemn as well as serious occasion. His activities helped to remind the disputants that this was all academic and not an occasion for more serious excitement.

His place in the proceedings is indicated by G. P. Peacock. "The Proctor called up the varier or prevaricator, who having ended his speech, is dismissed by the Proctor, and then the philosopher is called for by him. Whilst he is reading his position the Beadle delivers out his verses in the like manner as they did in the morning at the Divinity Act."[3] As an example of what verses the Beadle passed around, we can refer to Milton's

[2] *Milton—Private correspondence and academic exercises*, trans. from the Latin by Phyllis B. Tillyard . . . (Cambridge, 1932), p. 94. Five lines are in the original Latin without a translation.

[3] *Observations of the Statutes of Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1841), Appendix B, LXXXII.

poem, "Natura non pati senium."[4] Milton tells us in Epistle 3 to Gill, a letter dated July 2, 1628,[5] that he was sending a copy of the verses which he had composed for the University Commencement for the use "of a certain Fellow of our College who was to act as respondent in the philosophical disputation in this commencement."

The procedure at commencement in 1620 is described by Sir Simonds D'Ewes in his autobiography.[6] On this occasion we are told that the wit of the prevaricator was indeed pitiful, but that the usual procedure was followed—that is, the senior brother, the senior Commencing Master of Arts, disputed upon the prevaricator, and the several opponents took their turn with the respondent. Then followed the oaths and investiture.

We have by good fortune the prevarication which was delivered by Thomas Randolph in 1632,[7] the year in which John Milton proceeded to Master of Arts. "The scene of commencement was Gt. St. Mary's Church thronged with the whole University from the Vice-Chancellor and heads of Houses to the undergraduates in the belfry. After the disputations carried on by the new Doctors and Masters, the witty Latin speech of the prevaricator in which he played upon the terms of one of the theses came as a refreshing interlude on hilarity."[8] The thesis on which Randolph varies is "*Veritas in Intellectu fundatur et pendet in veritate rei?*"[9]

After a fairly lengthy introduction referring to himself and his place in University life, and noting humorously the fact that he had lost one of his fingers, he proceeds to the body of the speech itself. He takes most of his time pointing out what can be said about the first term of the thesis, *veritas*. Naturally enough, his first remarks are an amplification of the old motto *in vino veritas*. He spends less time with the discussion of the other terms of the thesis, dismissing the conjunction *et* as being concerned primarily with the women, since *et* is a copulative conjunction. He cannot find any interest in hanging amongst the Puritans because the Puritans hate the cross. He concludes with a reference to Peter Hausted, whose comedy, *Rival Friends*, had been played before the King in March and published the same month. The play, Randolph says, is an excellent comedy, but there is something a little silly about rushing it into print. His own comedy, acted the same time, *Jealous Lovers*, was not published until 1634, but there were no hard feelings on Hausted's part, for he wrote Randolph's epitaph when that unfortunate poet died in 1635.

Another prevarication which was delivered at a commencement in Milton's days was by James Duport during his first year as an M.A. He subsequently had a career as a scholar and teacher and ecclesiastical dignitary. The manuscript gives the date as 1631. The thesis upon which Duport varies is "Gold may be produced by Chemical Art."[10] He jests about his own small stature, refers to the *terrae filius* orations at Oxford,

[4] *The Works of John Milton*, I, 260-66.

[5] *Ibid.*, XII, 8-13.

[6] *The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes*, ed. J. O. Halliwell (London, 1845), I, 145. See also John Howard Marsden, *College Life in the Time of James The First* (London, 1851), pp. 104-09; this work is illustrated by an unpublished diary of Sir Symonds D'Ewes. The original manuscript of the diary is Harleian Manuscript 646.

[7] *Poetical and Dramatic Works of Thomas Randolph*, ed. W. Carew Hazlitt (London, 1875), II, 675-80.

[8] G. C. Moore Smith in the *Wharton Lecture* on "Thomas Randolph" which was read May 18, 1927, and published in London, p. 25.

[9] *Works of Thomas Randolph*, II, 675.

[10] Printed in Christopher Wordsworth's *Scholae Academicae* (Cambridge, 1877), p. 274. The manuscript is in Caius College Library, Cambridge, Manuscript 627-250.

and presents a most outrageous collection of recipes for making gold chemically. He greets those in his audience who, "because of their gravity, seem Fathers, and those who, because of their levity, are Fathers in fact." The prevarication is enlivened with Latin verses, frequent puns, and references to University life. Puns, of course, are a mainstay in academic oratory, as well as in the plays of Shakespeare.

Let the reader decide whether these prevarications violated the principles laid down by the Vice-Chancellor and heads of colleges *de modestia*. "Prevaricators, triposers and other disputants should thereafter abstain from mimic salutations and gesticulations, ridiculous jokes and scurrilous jeers at the laws, statutes or ordinances of the University, or the magistrates, Professors, or graduates."[11] The triposes were of a less exalted nature than the prevarications of the University Commencement, and were attached to the appropriate acts concerned with the graduation of Bachelors into the higher orders of academic life. Two examples of student oratory are printed in the surviving works of John Cleveland. Cleveland entered Christ's College, Cambridge, two years after Milton, and received his Bachelor's degree in 1632, whereupon he transferred to St. John's College, where he was elected a Fellow M.A. in 1635. His student works are preserved among other orations in a volume published in 1661. This contains "An Oration delivered in the Public Schools when he was a Junior Bachelor and was to dispute upon the Tripos," and another of like nature, "An oration spoken by the same author in the public schools when he took upon him the office of Father."[12] The first of these is very short, but does refer to his debate on the tripos or three-legged stool. The second is quite similar to Milton's "Prolusion" because the speaker does refer to his sons, speaking in the person of the Father. He refers to the University, the Alma Mater, as embodying an incestuous riddle, because the sons not only are the husband of the University but thus "being the husband of your mother, the son of your wife, and the father of your brother, nor do your divine fancies rest there."[13]

We learn more about Cleveland from John Berdan.[14] These orations by Cleveland while he was a junior bachelor were part of the regular formulation of the programs connected with the granting of the Bachelor degree to undergraduates. The orations were called tripos talks, and the speaker was usually referred to as a triposer. Like the prevaricator's orations, they were a part of the formal graduation performances, but whereas the prevarications were delivered in St. Mary's Church as part of the July commencement ceremonies, the tripos speeches were delivered as part of the Bachelor's commencement earlier in the academic year, in the schools of the University.

Milton's "Sixth Prolusion" owes a great deal to the influence of both the prevarications and the tripos. It, however, took place in the College, not in the schools or as part of a commencement program. Perhaps it owes something to an undergraduate burlesque of commencement procedures which is de-

[11] *Statuta Cantabrigiensis Academiae* (Cambridge, 1758), p. 336.

[12] *Poems by John Cleavland with additions* (London, 1661). The first oration appears in Latin (p. 131 f.) and in English (p. 133 f.); the Latin of the second oration is on pp. 138-42, the English on pp. 142-46.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 144.

[14] *The Poems of John Cleveland*, ed. John Milton Berdan (New York, 1911), Introduction, p. 62.

scribed by Sir Simonds D'Ewes, and is reported in *College Life*.[15]

This performance was a "salting." The undergraduates were assembled in the Hall of their own College, and certain Senior Sophisters, third or fourth year undergraduates, were selected to be "Fathers," each assigned a number of freshmen as sons. Thus there was enacted a burlesque upon the public exercises of the University Graduation and of the Bachelors' Graduations in the schools. The freshmen were required to answer questions, and perform to the satisfaction of the sophisters. The ceremony was called salting because any freshman who did ill in these performances was compelled to drink a certain quantity of salted beer. In his autobiography D'Ewes admits that the day after the ceremony he did not feel at all well.[16] Either there was too much beer or too much salt. Probably Milton's vacation exercise resembled the ceremonies of Freshmen initiation more than a University ceremony connected with the granting of a degree. Milton took upon himself the function of a Father in imitation of graduation exercises, and the young people present in the Hall of his College were picked on to represent his sons. Milton's comments on the exalted nature of his audience should be taken with the proper grain of salt. Certainly the sons were something lower than sophisters in their academic rank. For instance when Milton calls out "Rivers arise" he is referring to two young men named Rivers. (The Rivers boys named George and Nizel entered Christ's College, Cambridge, in May, 1628, just in time for salting.[17] The ceremony of salting was sufficiently accepted by University authorities to enable tutors to charge their young men in their books a fee for the purpose. Simonds D'Ewes at St. John's College paid three shillings and fourpence. The account books of Joseph Mead at Christ's College record that Thomas Halten, who was admitted February 2, 1628-29, was charged two shillings.

Milton refers to the young people in his audience as his "sons." He discusses what his "sons" are and finally decides that he shall imagine them as predicaments, the categories of Aristotelian logic. The relation indicated by the two brothers would be a blood relationship in fact, so either of the boys might be the "son" named "relation."

The head note to this exercise as Milton printed it indicates that the speech was delivered in the college, the Great Hall of which would house all those present. The locale of the talk in Christ's College is substantiated by references to college servants. There is talk of fiery furnaces and the dangers of being consumed, which the audience must undergo in order to get into the Hall. These references gain their point from the fact that the College porter from 1620 to 1638 was John Sparkes. Furness appears in the College Account Book[18] several times, which indicates payments to him for work done, on the wall of the Hall and painting the College buttery. Hence we can conjecture that Milton's burlesque oration was not actually concerned with the College Commencement, but might have been associated with more informal activities such as the salting of verdant freshmen.[19]

[15] D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, p. 14 f.

[16] See note 6. There are scattered references to "salting" in the *Autobiography*.

[17] John Peile, *Biographical Register of Christ's College, 1505-1905* (Cambridge, 1910-13), p. 319.

[18] *Christ's College Account Book* for the years 1622-39, a manuscript in the Muniment Room of the College.

[19] See John Peile in *Christ's College in Former Days*, a series of articles reprinted from the College magazine and edited by Harris Rackham (Cambridge, 1939).

A PROBLEM OF ASSIMILATION

Ray Irwin

ONE of the commonest assimilations in English speech is found in words like *nature, signature, suture, indenture, saturate,* and *century.* Each of these words contains the same difficult sequence of sounds: the sound [t] followed by [jɚ]. The sequence is difficult because it is hard for the tongue to go rapidly from [t] to [jɚ].[1] When this sequence is pronounced, therefore, the [j] becomes assimilated, its place being taken by [ʃ], and absence of stress reduces the [ur] to [ɚ] in some words, and to [ər] in others. And so the standard pronunciations of them are ['netʃɚ], ['sɪgnətʃɚ], ['sɛntʃərɪ], etc.

Almost everyone accepts these pronunciations. The words would sound stilted to most people if pronounced without assimilation: ['net,jʊr], ['sɛnt,jʊrɪ], ['sɪgnət,jʊr], and no one except the very conservative speaker would pronounce them thus.

When this combination of sounds occurs between words, however, or, more precisely, when it is divided between words in a sandhi assimilation, efforts are sometimes made in our elementary and secondary schools to require that they be pronounced without assimilation, and this has probably resulted in a vulgarism which is the main concern of this article.

Mr. Irwin is Associate Professor of Speech, Syracuse University.

[1] When the syllable that follows is stressed, as in *attune* [ə'tjun] or *student* ['stjudnt], then the sequence presents less of a problem, because one can take time to form the two sounds preparatory to making the "stroke" of the vowel.

In word combinations like *state your name, at your convenience, suit yourself, indent your paragraph, sat your eight dolls in a row* and *he sent your remark,* as well as *don't you, can't you,* and so forth, children are drilled to say, for *state your name,* [stet jʊr nəm]; for *don't you,* [dont ju]; for *sent your remark,* [sɛnt jʊr rɪ'mɑrk]. And this is done in the interest of purity of speech, so that children will not say ['don,tʃʌ], ['won,tʃʌ] and ['kæn,tʃʌ]. In their efforts to speak in an "educated" way, children therefore try to make this sound sequence without assimilation. They can do it when they are "word-sounding" their recitations, but in normal rapid speech they fail, since this articulatory sequence tends to be assimilated in some way. The assimilation they unconsciously hit upon is that of dropping the [t] and putting a glottal stop in its place, so that instead of saying [wont ju] they say [woʔju], instead of [stet jʊr nem], [steʔ jɚ nem], instead of [sɛnt jʊr rɪ'mɑrk], [sɛ̃ʔjɚ rɪ'mɑrk].

I have found this "glottal stop solution" to be in the speech of some people in every state from New York west to California, and from Minnesota south to New Mexico. Tests I have run on my students at Syracuse reveal that more than a third of them use the glottal stop, pronouncing *Annie get your gun* and *paint your wagon,* for example, ['æni gɛʔ jɚ gʌn] and [pẽɪʔ jɚ 'wægən].

The rightness of the other assimilation is readily apparent when one puts single words in one column and word-combinations in another, the combinations pre-

senting indentical articulatory situations:

nature	state your name
signature	at your convenience
suture	suit yourself
indenture	indent your paragraphs
saturate	you sat your eight dolls in a row
century	he sent your remark to headquarters.

No one would use the familiar "glottal stop solution" in single words. One does not hear, for example, ['ne ʔ jɔ˞], ['sɛ̃ ʔ jərɪ] or ['sæ ʔ jɔ˞ˌet]. Yet these pronunciations are no less correct than are their sandhi assimilation counterparts noted above.

I have labeled the "glottal stop solution" a vulgarism because it is a mistake made as a result of misinformation. It is such a wide-spread mistake that the individual speech teacher can hope to make only small inroads in correcting it. I believe the effort to be worthy, nonetheless, since it is our duty to eliminate, so far as possible, impedimenta to freely flowing and precise speech in our students.

THE FORUM

Official Communications From The Executive Secretary

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

All terms begin January 1, 1961.

Second Vice-President

Ernest J. Wrage, Northwestern University

Members of Administrative Council

Paul H. Boase, Oberlin College
Hubert C. Heffner, Indiana University

Regional Representative to The Legislative Assembly

Central Area

Alice Donaldson, Clayton High School, Clayton, Missouri
James M. Hill, High School, Topeka, Kansas
Ralph G. McGee, New Trier Township High School, Winnetka, Illinois
Melba R. Wixom, Waukegan Township High School, Waukegan, Illinois

Eastern Area

Coleman Bender, Emerson College
Wiley C. Bowyer, Mineola Public Schools, Mineola, New York
Eleanor M. Luse, University of Vermont
Robert E. Will, University of Rhode Island

Southern Area

Merrill G. Christophersen, University of South Carolina
Annabel D. Hagood, University of Alabama
Thomas A. Rousse, University of Texas
Franklin R. Shirley, Wake Forest College

Western Area

Herman Cohen, University of Oregon
S. Judson Crandell, Washington State University
George W. Dell, University of California, Los Angeles
Malcolm O. Sillars, San Fernando Valley State College

Representatives-at-Large in The Legislative Assembly

Chloe Armstrong, Baylor University
Jack M. Bain, Michigan State University
Dean C. Barnlund, Northwestern University
Campton Bell, University of Denver
Jack E. Bender, University of Michigan
Mildred F. Berry, Rockford College
Janet H. Bolton, University of Southern California
Herman H. Brockhaus, University of Wisconsin
Wayne E. Brockriede, University of Illinois
James L. Golden, Muskingum College
Halbert S. Greaves, University of Utah
R. Victor Harnack, University of Colorado
Kenneth Harwood, University of Southern California
Mason A. Hicks, Purdue University
Gordon F. Hostettler, Temple University
Erling S. Jorgensen, Montana State University
Thomas R. Lewis, Florida State University
Charles W. Lomas, University of California, Los Angeles
Charles A. McGlon, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
Ralph A. Micken, Southern Illinois University
Wayne C. Minnick, Florida State University
Bea Olmstead, Hamtramck Public Schools, Hamtramck, Michigan
Gregg Phifer, Florida State University
Mary Margaret Robb, University of Colorado
Alma J. Sarett, University of Florida
Grace Walsh, Wisconsin State College
Robert O. Weiss, DePauw University
Forest L. Whan, Kansas State College
Donald M. Williams, University of Texas
Helene H. Wong, University of Hawaii

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The following constitutional amendment was passed by a vote of 1,035 to 76.

Amend Article IX, Section 6, Line 18, concerning membership in the Executive Committee of the Legislative Assembly by inserting after the phrase "term of two years" the following: "If a member of the Assembly shall be elected to the Executive Com-

mittee to serve during the final year of his membership in the Assembly, he shall serve for the one year only and by the procedure set forth in the By-Laws (Article III, Section 5) the Assembly Nominating Committee shall provide for the unexpired term."

OWEN PETERSON
Executive Secretary

(Term expired June 30, 1960.)

NEW SAA ADDRESS

With the expiration of Owen Peterson's term as executive secretary, the national offices were moved from Louisiana State University to Indiana University. Communications about membership, subscriptions to SAA journals, Teacher Placement Service, and other official matters should be sent to Robert C. Jeffrey, Speech Association of America, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

ROBERT C. JEFFREY
Executive Secretary

CORRIGENDA

In Wallace Bacon's article "The Dangerous Shores: From Elocution to Interpretation" in the April, 1960, issue, lines 19-23 on page 150 should read "then it seems also true that the fullest kind of reading of works of literature is the most pleasurable and the most valuable kind of reading." (An error occurred in resetting the lines after the author had read proof.)

In the same issue on page 222 the title of the book under review should read *Guide to Play Selection* (rather than *Production*).

ENTHYMEME REVISITED

To the Editor:

Lloyd F. Bitzer in his perceptive article "Aristotle's Enthymeme Revisited" (*QJS*, December 1959) refers a number of times to Edward M. Cope's *An Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric*, but he overlooks the passage which coincides the most closely with his own conclusion.

Bitzer's basic position is that the distinctive characteristic of the enthymeme is that the speaker and his audience construct it jointly. On page 93 Cope makes almost the same statement: "Though the rhetorician is not strictly and formally dependent like the dialectician upon the concessions of an adversary, yet he is so in some sense upon his audience; for in ordinary cases he can only assume such principles and sentiments in conducting his argument as he knows will be acceptable to them, or which they are prepared to admit."

A second passage in Cope which seems to support Bitzer is Cope's remark on dialectic: "it depends absolutely for its arguments upon the concessions of the opponent, real or imaginary" (p. 88). If the audience in rhetoric can be viewed as the analogue of the opponent in dialectic, then Bitzer's conclusion again is affirmed.

WAYNE N. THOMPSON
University of Illinois, Chicago

FORENSIC THERAPY

To the Editor:

It has long been recognized that there are many educational benefits to be derived from competitive debating. In fact, it is usually justified upon this premise.

There is, however, a second area of benefit which, judging by the lack of literature in relation to it, seems to be largely unexplored. This neglected area is the "therapeutic" effect that debating can have upon the personality of the speech-defective debater.

I have discussed this at length with a number of coaches. The consensus was that few of them have ever had a "real" speech defective on their squad, nor have they seriously thought of encouraging one to go out for it. The question, therefore, seems to be: can an individual with a speech defect, everything else being equal, become an effective debater? It is my belief that he can. This conclusion is based primarily upon the experience of three individuals, all stutterers. Admittedly, this is too small a group for any definite conclusions to be drawn. Nevertheless, the indications are quite encouraging.

One of the subjects is presently debating in high school, and the other two are debating in college. Though the former's stuttering tends to be quite severe in most situations, while debating she usually experiences no difficulty. This has had a positive effect upon her self-confidence which has carried over into all her activities. In this case the debate experience has definitely been of direct therapeutic value.

This same thing was true with the two college debaters. Both had definite feelings of inferiority because of their speech problem. However, after defeating several topnotch teams and accumulating some first-speaker ratings, their self-concepts became modified and more realistic. I can think of no other way that this change of attitude could have been brought about as rapidly.

If we accept the basic assumption that the primary justification for debating is to benefit the individual taking part (with the contest elements being secondary), then we must certainly agree that therapeutic benefits should be as acceptable as educational ones.

FRANKLIN H. SILVERMAN
Emerson College

CHORAL SPEAKING

To the Editor:

It was a pleasure to read Agnes Curren Hamm's letter "Why the Professional Cold Shoulder?" in the February, 1960, *QJS*. Choral speaking seems to have declined in the United States because much of the early enthusiasm for it was based on wrong motives and inadequate training.

To Marjorie Gullan—I worked with her in England for many years—the purpose of choral speaking was twofold: primarily, it is an aid to the appreciation of poetry; secondarily and incidentally, it is a means of developing the voices and interpretative powers of those taking part. But to many teachers choral speaking was merely an excuse for self-display. Miss Gullan realized this, and after her last visit to the States she was afraid, in spite of the work of genuine followers like Miss Hamm herself, that showmanship was taking over, and that poetry was being butchered to make a conductor's holiday. She found these malpractices:

> The choice of unsuitable material, e.g., sonnets and other poems expressive of one person's intimate mood;
>
> Music and sound-effects used as a background to the speaking, as if a poet's words were not good enough to stand alone;
>
> Flamboyant costumes for choir members, like glorified marching girls;
>
> The "staging" of poems with backdrops and elaborate lighting, e.g., Tennyson's "The Splendour Falls" complete with castle, bugle, and fading sunset;
>
> The arbitrary breaking-up of lines irrespective of the poem's form or meaning;
>
> "Harmonizing" for the sake of vocal effect, so that the audience was more conscious of sound than sense;
>
> The use of artificial speech tunes;
>
> In fact, all the old elocutionary tricks which public opinion had forced teachers to abandon in the individual speaking of verse.

It is not surprising that, where this

happened, choral speaking fell into disrepute. But it was the misuse of choral speaking that was discredited, not choral speaking itself. I know, from twenty-five years' experience in schools, that there is no better way of helping children to enjoy poetry and to realize the variety of its types and styles; but it calls for common sense and integrity on the part of the teacher. The poem must be more important than himself. He must develop the choir's critical appreciation to the point where interpretation becomes a democratic rather than a totalitarian activity. And he must balance choral speaking not only with the individual and small-group speaking of prose and verse, but also with the everyday use of language, so that the choral speaking is an extension of normal speech and not a distortion of it.

I hope that Miss Hamm's letter will encourage readers to reconsider their verdict of discarding choral speaking.

CLIVE SANSOM
Speech Education Centre
307 Macquarie Street
Hobart
Tasmania, Australia

Marjorie Gullan, with whom Mr. Sansom was long associated in London, was well known in the United States. Many of her books were published here. In the thirties, she lectured in this country and addressed a session of an SAA convention. She was founder of the Verse Speaking Choirs of Glasgow and of London, the Speech Institute, and the Speech Fellowship.

Miss Gullan died October 8, 1959. A memorial by John Hampden was carried in *The Times* (October 13, p. 15). Mr. Sansom's tribute, "Marjorie Gullan," was published in *Speech and Drama* (London) in January, 1960. Her influence was great in improving speech and heightening the enjoyment of poetry among adults, and among children in the British schools.

INVITATION

Brief comment, additions to sources, and queries about articles, which writers may hesitate to cast in a long formal letter, may be sent in short version to the editor, who feels the journal is presently somewhat deficient in responses from readers.

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

ROBERT G. GUNDERSON, *Editor*

AUDITUS . . .

John W. Black

1.

Whose open gate drags in each voice and sound,
That through the shaken air passes by. . . .[1]

Georg von Békésy is an engineer. He was a telephone engineer in Hungary, an electrical engineer in Germany, and his quest for a systematic understanding of hearing has brought out his capacities as a mechanical engineer (his micro-manipulator and stereoscopic microscope permit him to work in microns, to duplicate perforations of cochlear membranes at distances of one-twentieth of a millimeter, and to bounce pieces of iron on Reissner's membrane). It has made him a micro-electrical engineer (he measures the stray voltage in the cochlea as his needle electrode approaches the basilar membrane of a guinea pig, as it pierces the membrane, is advanced through the endolymph, and through Reissner's membrane, back into the perilymph). It has made him a micro-civil engineer (a collection of varied human cochleas permits him to match any fresh specimen to one that has been surveyed earlier and to explore the dying one rapidly and efficiently).

Von Békésy has worked in hearing for more than thirty years. One half of his four score papers were written in German. Nearly all are included in the present series that treats experimental apparatus and techniques, sound conduction to the inner ear, the psychology of hearing, and cochlear mechanics.

Apart from his professional skill, von Békésy is clearly well-versed in history and in the development of art, and has a proclivity for arranging materials to emphasize climaxes. Page one betokens much that is to follow. A reproduction of a fifteenth-century Persian miniature painting stands in contrast to a' sixteenth-century woodcut. The subject matters are inconsequential. Of importance, the former is said to portray individuals and objects with little perspective or relation to one another; the latter, unity and perspective. So it is with the scientist—and the author: he can choose to work with isolated aspects of his subject matter or with inter-relations and systems. The profundity of the observation is irrelevant; what matters is that here is the first analogy, highly figurative, of dozens that are to come into the reports of scores of scientific investigations of hearing.

The foregoing analogy portends another feature of this compilation of scientific reports: considerable historical scope and a healthy respect for earlier generations of theorists and experimentalists in hearing. Some of these papers appeared in the twenties. The workers whose viewpoints von Békésy

Mr. Black is Professor of Speech, The Ohio State University. He was editor of Speech Monographs, *1958-59.*

[1] The title and transitional passages are from Phineas Fletcher's *The Purple Island,* Canto v (1633).

amended are no longer contemporaneous. The effect is more jarring than the one that comes from turning through thirty-five years of a scientific journal. There, historical perspective is easily maintained; here, the kaleidoscopic view touches upon the incongruous. This reader blamed himself for unwittingly focusing upon auditory theory with a reverence for the present that is more appropriately reserved for annual automobile shows. This self-censure was the more poignant as it became apparent that von Békésy was never critical of auditory theory simply because it was propounded in an earlier generation. Helmholtz (*Sensation of Tone*, 1863) is accorded the respect that would go to a versatile and comprehensive contemporary investigator.

2.

The entrance winding. . . .
Where stands a braced drumme, whose sounding head
—obliquely placed—struck by the circling aire,
Gives instant warning of each sound's repair,

. . . . . .

The drumme is made of substance hard and thin:

. . . . . .

This drumme divides the first and second part,
In which three hearing instruments reside;

. . . . . .

The first an hammer called, whose outgrown sides
Lie on the drumme; but with his swelling end
Fixt in the hollow stithe, there fast abides:
The stithe's short foot doth on the drumme depend,
His longer in the stirrup surely plac't:
The stirrup's sharp side by the stithe embrac't
But his broad base ti'd to a little window fast. . . .

The form of the passage given below appears in one context or another many, many times. The content is immaterial to the present point. Here is a variety of approaches, a historical reference, the use of a model, of analogy, of logic, references to quantitative measurements, and also an implied reference to a series of unreported tests. This may not illustrate the rhetoric of science generally, but it does exemplify the scientific rhetoric of von Békésy:

According to Helmholtz, a further enhancement of pressure is achieved because the eardrum does not act like a piston carrying the manubrium along as an integral part but acts in a peculiar way. . . . In order for the eardrum to produce a pressure transformation of this sort, it is necessary that the radial fibers be inelastic and that the circular fibers be relatively compliant, so that the conical form of the eardrum can be altered.

Studies in which small portions of the eardrum were cut out showed that there was actually a difference in the strength of the membrane in the different directions. However, the elasticity in the two directions was of the same order of magnitude. The same was indicated when the normal eardrum is touched with a fine hair. The depressed surface is nearly always completely circular if the tissue is in a fresh condition. On the other hand, a rubber membrane that is stretched unevenly will show an eliptical depression when tested in this manner. Therefore, we must not expect to find a greater pressure transformation than is provided by the ratio between the surfaces of eardrum and stapedial foot-plate.

If we regard the eardrum as a stretched membrane in which the manubrium of the malleus is imbedded, then according to the extensive calculations of Frank, only a part of the pressure acting on the eardrum will be transferred to the manubrium. Tests were made in which circular stretched membranes similar to the eardrum were provided with a rod extending from one edge to the middle and with an axis rotation at the edge. When the membrane was acted upon by air pressure applied to one side, the rod could be brought back to its resting position by applying a force to the center of the membrane which was about one-fourth of the total force applied to the surface of the membrane. If in addition an air cavity corresponding to that of the middle ear was placed behind the membrane, the pressure transfer was still smaller. This happened because the opposing force of the compressed volume of air reduced the effect of the unilateral air pressure.

To measure the pressure transformation in the human ear, the following experiment was carried out in cadaver specimens. . . .

Highlights in von Békésy's treatment of the middle ear and bone conduction include discoveries of the axis of rotation of the ossicles, of equal amplitude curves for eardrum vibrations, of resistance of the middle ear transmission system, of the impinging pressures at the oval and round windows, and the auditory effect of removal of the eardrum and the ossicles; of the vibratory pattern of the head in response to one's own speech, and measurement and conjecture of the impact of one's own speech on different points on the surface of the body with particular reference to the built-in protective system that guards the ear from the full intensity of one's own voice.

3.

There the equal judge attending day and night,
Receives the ent'ring sounds, and dooms each voice aright.

The topics of the psychology of hearing are standard: thresholds and the relation of sensations to stimuli. The experimental work was done in the early thirties and Stevens and Davis (1938) alluded to it thirty-five times, more often than to any other author. Especially notable was a report of a quantal characteristic of the neuro-process in hearing, a concept borrowed from physics and verified experimentally at low auditory frequencies. Localization of sound and spatial attributes of sounds, particularly clicks, were studied extensively in relation to binaural listening.

In the manner of Helmholtz and others, von Békésy studied and quantified the "roughness" of sound. Auditory fatigue was investigated in 1929.

Room acoustics and suitable reverberation time (1931) depend upon or at least relate closely to Stern's "conscious present," approximately 0.8 second. An event of this duration can be perceived as a whole; hence, auditory stimuli should not exceed the dimension, nor should room reverberation. The notion is interesting, is pertinent to speech, and is correlated by von Békésy with the length of nouns and verbs—presumably German. An observation for students of speech:

A speaker concentrates his attention on a listener, and when he is farther away, he regulates his voice so that its intensity will be maintained. . . . The relations seem to be entirely different for singing and the playing of a musical instrument. Here the attention is directed so much on the performance itself that the listener is considered incidentally.

Cochlear mechanics, part four of von Békésy's work, occupy 300 critical pages. The topic is paramount: "A choice of one theory [of hearing] or another can be made if the vibratory pattern of the membrane [basilar] is known." The quest for this information is exciting, suggestive of a mystery story. The search centers on the cochlea, a snail-like spiraling canal. The canal is about 2 mm. in diameter and is divided throughout its length by the basilar membrane. Near the base of the cochlea the membrane is about 0.1 mm. wide; at the apex, 0.5 mm. It is 35 mm. long. The cochlea is filled with liquid, principally perilymph. Reissner's membrane also runs the full course of the basilar membrane, the two seeming to originate together from the inner wall of the cochlea and to diverge at a 30° angle. Between the two membranes is a second fluid, endolymph. The Organ of Corti rests on the basilar membrane surrounded by endolymph. This tiny organ is an aggregation of cells, including hair cells, over which lies the flimsy tectorial membrane. Von Békésy observes, "Most man-made structures are characterized by

some sort of symmetry. But this architecture is similar to an asymmetric crystal with axes that are not perpendicular to one another." He used a slit lamp and a stereoscopic microscope to observe the mechanics of the cochlea in animals and in fresh human specimens. The translucent fibers were difficult to view and yielded limited information.

Again models, dimensional, not demonstrational, were brought into play. A principal model incorporated a fluid-filled channel, simulated membranes, and a driving "stapes." Successive improvements seemed to make the model a simplified and enlarged cochlea. Minute silver crystals, added to the mock-perilymph, revealed the movements of the liquid that were induced by the piston-like action of the "stapes." Four mutually exclusive types of movement of the basilar membrane have been conjectured by hearing theorists: a gross one upward or downward (the telephone theory), segmental vibration (the resonance theory), traveling waves, and standing waves. The model revealed a turbulence or eddy both above and below the "basilar membrane" with each sustained stimulation. The violence of the eddies corresponded to the amplitude of the stimulation; the location, to the frequency of stimulation. Eddies were set up near the "stapes" by high frequencies and remote from the "stapes" by low frequencies—consistent with a resonance theory of hearing.

The silver crystals tended to collect at the "upper" end of the "basilar membrane." This suggested a traveling wave, confirmed by direct visual observation with the stroboscope. Here, then, were both, evidence for a resonance interpretation and evidence for a traveling wave. Another wave became evident, a paradoxical one; it traveled from the "apex" of the cochlea downward toward the source of sound. Another model was developed—pendulums of different lengths loosely bound together by thongs near the points of suspension. The series, each setting an adjacent one in motion, did indeed generate a wave that travels toward the point of origin. (A motion picture of this model is generally available.) In considerable measure the observations on the artificial cochlea have been confirmed by work with cochleas from animals and humans.

The traveling wave along the basilar membrane prompted yet another important model. Von Békésy views the sense of hearing and the organ of hearing as closely akin to touch and its receptors. Hence, he chose to substitute touch for hearing in a study of traveling waves. He placed a pliable tube along the forearm and through controlling the motion of the liquid within the tube caused distensions to move along its length. Through a "basilar membrane" on each forearm a subject experienced various frequencies and extents of traveling waves, experienced the waves on the two arms in different phases, and reported apparent "beats." Absolute thresholds and difference limens were determined; some subjects—called by the author *good* ones—were especially consistent in reporting reproduceable observations.

Cochlear microphonics were first reported by Wever and Bray (1930) and have since been studied in depth. Von Békésy turned to the electrophysiology of the cochlea in the fifties. *Experiments in Hearing* rises to a climax with two of the final sections, "place of origin of the cochlear microphonics" and "shearing microphonics produced by vibrations in the cochlea." With micro-pipettes of one-third micron diameter he traces the origin of first-order microphonics to the Organ of Corti, and cer-

tain of them to the cells of Hensen or Claudius within the Organ of Corti. These potentials may arise with movements that occur between the tectorial membrane and the basilar membrane, movements that are indigenous in the responses of the basilar membrane to auditory stimuli.

Unanswered, and thus by way of anticlimax, is the question about the role, if any, that cochlear microphonics play in hearing.

4.

The drumme is made of substance hard and thin;
Which if some falling moisture chance to wet,
The loudest sound is hardly heard within.

Defective hearing gives rise to audiology, a focal point for many specialists. Davis and Silverman write and edit a comprehensive treatment of hearing loss and deafness. Introductions to the physics and psychophysics of hearing and the anatomy and physiology of the ear are brief but adequate. The medical character of hearing loss receives some emphasis through priority in the ordering of the topics, and also by the excellence of the treatment.

Audiometers and hearing aids are essentially electronic. They are explained in a manner to emphasize the engineering of these devices—aids and tools of the audiologist. Special audiometric tests are spelled out with the clarity and detail of a circuit diagram. Clearly, the authors place a premium upon the reader's acquiring insight into the principles of the testing of hearing and of the conditions for selecting or not selecting a hearing aid as an outcome of the tests.

The remaining one-third of the book treats counseling and special training for the deaf and hard of hearing individual. The treatments are somewhat cursory and the topics inadequately differentiated. The authors of "Speech Reading," "Auditory Training," and "Counseling" have difficulty keeping out of each other's chapters. (The reader learns too often that the deaf and hard of hearing child should use all available sensory channels.) V. A. Ramsdell provides a singularly good introduction to the psychology of the hard of hearing and deaf adult.

Davis and Silverman share with von Békésy an interest in the history of their subject and enliven their book with passages that were "too good to omit." An appendix includes different kinds of materials for speech audiometry, including a "first presentation" of sentences of everyday speech developed at Central Institute for the Deaf.

5.

But if it once grow thick . . .
It bars all passage to the inner room;
No sounding voice unto his seat may come;
The lazy sense still sleeps, unsummoned by his drumme.

After Ramsdell's meaty fourteen pages on the psychology of the hard of hearing and deaf, the first one-third of Edna Simon Levine's *The Psychology of Deafness* seems verbose. ("With this unsuspected disclosure, the dramatic phenomenology of psychic dynamisms leapt from the psychiatrist's domain into the field of impaired hearing, where they have commanded major attention ever since.") Exactness comes under question with Davis' *Hearing and Deafness* (1947) entered in a footnote as a 1953 publication, and with the omission from the index of names that appear only in footnotes—informative footnotes.

Unlike Davis and Silverman, Levine saves the best part of her book for last. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation supported this study and the justification lies in the "handbook" that Levine

provides to accompany the psychological test and the interview of deaf and hard of hearing individuals. An appendix enumerates ninety-two studies of the deaf and the major psychological tests of each.

Somewhat unrelated to all else is an enumeration of sixty topics for potential research in connection with the deaf and a useful outline to follow in drawing up a research proposal—presumably for submission to the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

It has been a remarkable year for books about hearing. Yet another one is needed. Von Békésy stops short of stating a positive relationship between cochlear microphonics and hearing—or of stating a systematic theory of hearing. The topic is not central to the other two books. Pending the appearance of a new treatment of theories of hearing, the reader should keep at hand *Physiological Acoustics* (1954). It is largely consistent with the experimental work of von Békésy and Davis. It bears mention here both because co-author Wever made the translations for von Békésy and because the books under discussion need a theory of hearing alongside them on the shelf.

BOOKS REVIEWED

EXPERIMENTS IN HEARING. By Georg von Békésy. (Translated and Edited by E. G. Wever.) New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960; pp. x+745. $25.00.

HEARING AND DEAFNESS. By Hallowell Davis and S. Richard Silverman. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1960; pp. xviii+573. $8.00.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF DEAFNESS. By Edna Simon Levine. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960; pp. xii+383. $7.50.

PHYSIOLOGICAL ACOUSTICS. By Ernest Glen Wever and Merle Lawrence. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1954; pp. xii+454. $10.00.

NATURAL LANGUAGE FOR DEAF CHILDREN. By Mildred A. Groht. Washington, D. C.: The Volta Bureau, 1958; pp. xix+185. $5.70.

Books dealing with language training for the deaf, with a few exceptions directed toward pre-school children, emphasize the development of language as lessons, or are outlines of the language arts programs for the deaf, or are concerned with an analytical approach assuring correct sentence structure. As a result of these formal approaches, many deaf have been given stereotyped and parrot-like language devoid of spontaneity and individuality.

In this book, however, the child's needs, desires, and experiences are emphasized always in meaningful communicative situations out of which language skills grow. Language is allowed to develop in much the same way as it does for the normal hearing child. The teacher manipulates the environment in such a way that the child appreciates the use of language through meaningful participation as a listener first. Later he talks to communicate rather than to exhibit a skill. It is in this way that the child develops a normal attitude toward himself in relation to communication. This is a book about language and how best to fortify deaf children with the ability to use language in any phase of their lives.

In the book's twelve chapters, the natural approach to language is described lucidly and is imaginatively illustrated with examples of how the method might be taught. The first pages describe what is meant by language in communication and its development in normal children, and emphasize the importance of natural language for the deaf. In succeeding pages, the natural method is outlined in a sequence starting with the nursery school and continuing in steps through the entire special training program. In the last chapter there are suggestions for teachers of the deaf who might change from a system in current use to one in which the natural method is used.

This is a refreshing and most commendable point of view in language training and should enable many deaf children to be far more comfortable and competent in their contacts with the hearing world. In fact, the author states that through the use of the natural language principles, deaf children will have the opportunity to lead well-integrated and satisfying lives in a world made up of both deaf and hearing people—a world where the ability to communicate is of paramount necessity.

This book deserves the attention of all interested in any phase of the language arts, and the special attention of audiologists and, of course, teachers of the deaf.

VINCENT H. KNAUF
Indiana University

THE CASE FOR BASIC EDUCATION. Edited by James D. Koerner. Boston: Little, Brown, 1959; pp. xiii+256. $4.00.

Produced under the aegis of the Council for Basic Education, the eighteen essays comprising this book express the belief that our schools have set their sights too low and that correction is to be achieved by sustained and challenging study of "basic subjects." In this manner, the student is to find greater meaning and clearer direction for himself and his society. Presumed to be "basic" are citizenship, history, English, languages, mathematics, and science, each divided into appropriate subareas. Recognized as representative electives are art, music, philosophy, and speech.

Much of the content is both interesting and challenging, and it is recommended that the book be read in its entirety. Only in this way can the philosophical impact be appreciated fully, the divergence of certain viewpoints discovered, and the effects of implementation be sensed. In addition, such reading may suggest to some how certain aspects of the total educational problem and frequent presumptions of unique virtue supposedly inherent in "basic subjects" might have contributed to the decline of the substantive scholar as an influential person in public school policy-making.

Sophisticated constructive critics of our present educational policies may be dismayed at the introductory "case" presented by Clifton Fadiman. After pointing out some provocative problems and potentials, he erodes his own argument by equating the austere, non-elective New York City education *circa* 1916 and the absence of juvenile delinquency (pp. 8-9). In addition, he implies that his generation emerged with a superior educational foundation and a sense of relationship and meaning in life not found today. The book fortunately closes with a more realistic perspective of the potential for improvement in terms of contemporary problems, needs, and resources as analyzed by school board member, H. M. Schwab.

Unfortunately, the book contains some assumptions that must be questioned and ignores some problems that must be met. It is particularly vulnerable in assuming that the chosen subjects represent all the basic ones. For instance, it is not clear why economics is not included or why psychology is said to be more complex than certain other choices. There is the suggestion that man is essentially intellectual. Only in literature is his aesthetic potential given primary attention. How art and music, forms common to all cultures and capable of giving expression to man's deepest and most noble impulses, and through which he finds meaning at both the most elementary and the most sophisticated levels, can be relegated to the status of electives is difficult to understand. There is an implication that the chosen basic subjects will be well taught, yet too little mention is made of the critical role of the teacher who possesses ability, integrity, imagination, and freedom. Problems of social organization, economic pressures, moral values and related forces operating on the student, the teacher, and the curriculum are given far too little attention.

Teachers of speech will find both comfort and concern in the two essays on English. The chapter on literature fails to recognize that most poetry has been written to be read aloud and that drama was meant to be performed. The author of the chapter on composition brings to his treatment either unfortunate experience in or a wealth of ignorance about speech. It is amazing to find no recognition of the relationship of speech and thought, the central place of speech in social and political organization, and its role in aesthetic expression. The classical foundations of rhetoric and its role in a democracy seem to have escaped his attention. Happily for speech, Professor Bower Aly presents a clear and powerful exposition of the deliberative functions—the relation of knowledge to effective expression—and the fundamental importance of the arts of discourse in a free society. This is a strong argument for including speech in the basic group.

THORREL B. FEST
University of Colorado

THE FIRST MODERN COMEDIES: THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ETHEREGE, WYCHERLEY AND CONGREVE. By Norman N. Holland. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959; pp. 274. $5.50.

Restoration comedies have almost always succeeded in the theatre beyond reasonable expectation; yet, according to Professor Hol-

land, ever since the seventeenth-century critics almost without exception have "damned them for bad morals or belittled them by saying they deal only with 'manners.'" At the outset, Professor Holland declares that both of these paths to critical damnation are silly, and then attempts to lead us down the path of righteous evaluation through comprehensive analyses of the eleven comedies of Etherege, Wycherley, and Congreve. The plays are studied in relation to the basic theme which the author finds to be intrinsic to all Restoration comedy: the discrepancy between appearance and nature, the contrasting of two kinds of perception, or to use Wycherley's phrases, the dichotomy of "Eye Sight" and "reason's insight." The central problem here is: "how the nucleus of personality shows itself through the shell of appearances and how it gets to know other nuclei through their shells." In his background chapters, Professor Holland refutes the concept of Restoration comedy as a coterie fad by examining the "sources" of the current ideas of the period, and by demonstrating that a "real intellectual substance" existed, a substance which is not too far removed from the twentieth-century world-view. The comedies appear to pulsate a synthesis of the abstract thought of the age's leading political theorists and metaphysicians.

Professor Holland's central theme is convincingly developed and documented, although, as sometimes happens in this type of criticism, excessive analysis at times strains it beyond reasonable dramatic limits. For example, the *double-entendre* of the famous "China scene" in *The Country Wife* becomes for the author "a simile of extraordinary complexity," when he imposes upon it the critical over-view of appearance and reality. "China, furthermore, is an object of surface aspects. Originally mere clay, it has become worked and decorated to the point where its appearance now completely hides its earthly origin." The theatre man must wonder if in the progress of a production it is really possible for an audience to perceive this delicate nuance in a scene which by the nature of its delectable indelicacy is so wonderfully funny for itself.

Except for an occasional lapse, however, Professor Holland is aware that he is dealing with essentially dramatic works. This is, indeed, a refreshing and encouraging critical viewpoint, to which some recent writers on the subject have given lip-service but have then blissfully ignored. This critic attempts, at least, to indicate how the parts of the plays—plots, characters, events, language—all fit together into a unified dramatic whole. In an important chapter, "The Critical Failure," the author parades before the reader a summary of three centuries of commentary on the comedies, and condemns the criticisms as impressionistic; that is, critics for the most part have examined the plays only after imposing preconceptions upon them, rather than having reached conclusions as a result of the examinations.

In his final chapter, Professor Holland suggests ways in which the insights of literary criticism—especially his own viewpoint that the main theme of the comedies concerns the discrepancy between appearance and nature—can be translated into dramatic action. This valuable discussion may serve as a basis for the producer's approach. Herein will be found general suggestions for cutting, directing, acting, setting, costuming, and lighting the plays. For readers of this speech journal and our friends in correlated disciplines such a chapter should prove interesting and perhaps enlightening. We wish that the author nad included more theatrical insights in his discussions of the individual plays, perhaps substituting more immediate comment for the sometimes tedious thematic weaving, perhaps suggesting how specific scenes might be mounted, how certain roles might be acted. If, after all, the comedies are, as Holland avows, plays first and foremost, then more dramatic and theatrical commentary would seem not only essential, but would be eagerly welcomed.

KALMAN A. BURNIM
Tufts University

BERNARD SHAW AND THE NINETEENTH CENTURY TRADITION. By Julian B. Kaye. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1958; pp. xvi+222. $4.00.

By now it is commonplace to remark that Shaw is going the way of Shakespeare. He has been lionized, eulogized, nearly canonized, and even footnoted—a literary compliment of some magnitude—by those busily engaged in polishing Shaw's halo or sharpening his horns. As the shelf of Shaviana grows, Julian B. Kaye's contribution is particularly welcome. In this well-appointed book, Kaye lends considerable dimension to an understanding of the thought of the bearded sage. A self-confessed Shavian, Kaye nevertheless deals directly with the perplexing attitudes toward men and affairs that Shaw held during the last thirty-five years of his life. How could Shaw be so muddleheaded

in the popular, if not in the intellectual view as to praise those bunglers of history, Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin? How could a man of such shrewd understanding be so perverse in the face of the calamities of the twentieth century? Kaye's answer is not to read Shaw as a peculiarly long-lived contemporary author, but as one who lugged the guts of nineteenth-century liberal thought into the nether room of the twentieth.

The influences on Shaw of such thinkers as Carlyle, Compte, Mill, Butler, Marx, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Kant, Morris and others have, of course, been previously observed; here they have been developed in some detail with ample reference to the plays and non-dramatic writings in the Shaw canon. Shaw's work, to Kaye, emerges as a synthesis of the intellectual and moral values of the last century; a world-view incompatible with the regimentation of thought characterizing Fascist and Communist societies. Shaw, unfortunately, failed to realize his strangeness to the new orders of the new century. To him they were linked, however tenuously, with his notion of socialism as a positive good; and any move in that direction, be it the October Revolution or the National Socialist forays of a Hitler or a Mussolini, must also be good. It seems incredible that Shaw could find it in himself, immediately after Dunkirk, to say of Hitler, "I have no prejudice against him personally; much that he has written and spoken echoes what I myself have written and said."

To some extent Shaw's failure to understand the new *Zeitgeist* is, as Kaye points out, a failure of a whole generation. Shaw's blunders by no means detract from Shaw as we customarily see him, a great nineteenth-century man of letters—the man who brought thought as well as fun back to the English drama.

DAVID WILEY
Longwood College

EDWIN FORREST: FIRST STAR OF THE AMERICAN STAGE. By Richard Moody. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960; pp. 416. $6.95.

Reading the public and private life story of Edwin Forrest may not stir us to unqualified affection for the man, but can hardly fail to instruct us trenchantly about the tone, conventions, and prevailing tastes in the American theatre of the nineteenth century. For more than three of its decades, Forrest was uniquely the abstract and chronicle of the times.

While theatre operated ostensibly under the system of stock companies of more or less fixed residence in the larger towns and cities, without doubt its vital force and central image was the itinerant star, who was regarded as virtually a solo performer. As the quintessence of popular actor, able to draw vast crowds in whatever he played, Forrest could dictate his own terms to the managers; and since he seems to have lived by Iago's advice, "Put money in thy purse," he drove ruthless bargains for his services. By offering them prize money, he induced playwrights to shape plays whose leading roles were cut exactly to the measure of his histrionic talents. For his idolatrous public, he cleverly nurtured the conception of himself as the forthright democratic man, heroically opposing the effete manners of the Old World. "Ned" Forrest, in the eyes of thousands of theatregoers, could do no wrong. Two weeks after the jury in his unsavory divorce trial had found him guilty of adultery, his public at the Broadway Theatre gave him an ovation lasting a half-hour; then Forrest in a curtain speech discoursed at some length upon the court's injustice. That he could do this with absolute confidence indicates how strong was the personal bond established between this actor and his audiences.

As Richard Moody carefully points out in what is by far the most thorough and balanced of several Forrest biographies, it is hazardous now to assess accurately his true abilities as an actor. Those, however, who too glibly have classed him as merely a brass-lunged roarer endowed with impressive biceps, may be surprised to learn of his constant efforts to perfect his interpretations, his line-readings especially, and of his insistence that members of his supporting casts measure up to their best. Although convenient to place the Forrest style as somewhere between Edmund Kean's thunder and flashes of lightning and Edwin Booth's revolutionary quietude, we must despair of finding the ultimate truth about his quicksilver art.

What we can appreciate is the fact that Forrest occupied center stage in a theatre itself more central to American popular culture than it is today. Apparently that theatre shared the period's floridity, pompousness, and frequent lapses of taste, alike evident in many effusions from press and pulpit, as well as in much of the architecture, sculpture, and painting. But there was gusto and energy, too. And the bills that went up to announce Edwin Forrest as Metamora, Othello, Spartacus, or Lear, could

arouse an interest and thrilled expectancy we can today only faintly imagine.

Though one might find fault with Mr. Moody's somewhat tediously detailed account of the Forrest divorce case, and wish that he had included a detailed analysis of at least one of the actor's Shakespearean prompt books, the student may rejoice in this honest book, a valuable and handsomely printed addition to American theatre history.

JONATHAN CURVIN
University of Wisconsin

THE ART OF RUTH DRAPER: HER DRAMAS AND CHARACTERS WITH A MEMOIR. By Morton Dauwen Zabel. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1960; pp. vi+373. $4.95.

"Now I want you to imagine *far* too much," said Beatrice Lillie as she bestowed her accolade of parody on Ruth Draper. Miss Lillie's line taps the secret of Miss Draper's art: undiluted imagination stripped of externals. Audiences found "a thrill in discovering they too can create," said Miss Draper. "They give me credit for it, but . . . what holds their attention most is what they themselves are able to give" (p. 93). This absolute trust in her audiences' creative impulse paid off handsomely. Alone on stage, without props or scenery, Miss Draper created a full company of players. Her success from New York to Stockholm was immediate and lasting. In the rich tradition of monologuists, from the elder Coquélin and Leland Powers to contemporary revue performers like Shelley Berman and Bob Newhart, Ruth Draper added new dimension to the established wit, caricature, and melodrama of the genre. Her art, says Morton Zabel, "was essentially one of acute empathy, insight, and recognition. . . ." (p. 100).

Mr. Zabel's book, prefaced by a lengthy introduction, includes thirty-five of Miss Draper's monologues. It is these sketches, which she performed in nearly every corner of the globe, that give the work a special significance. "I have to live with a sketch two, three, or five years before I am sure it has something in it," said Miss Draper, suggesting the *commedia dell' arte* approach she shared with other great performers of whistle-stop days. Improvised without script, Miss Draper's monologues were shaped by thousands of performances, no two of which were just alike. Only near the end of her career did she even trouble to write them down.

This reviewer has heard several trial tapes that Ruth Draper recorded in 1955 for RCA Victor which differ markedly in text and impact from Professor Zabel's "authorized" edition. Print has sapped much of their life. Lines that blazed when Miss Draper spoke them often seem saccharine or trite in print. Mr. Zabel readily admits the published sketches "are only approximations of what she made of them. . . ." (p. 93). Yet despite disappointment encountered by those who have seen Miss Draper and who may still hear her voice behind the bare scripts, these monologues are likely the richest contribution made to this neglected genre since Browning's.

One wishes that Mr. Zabel had spent more of his memoir assessing Miss Draper's contribution to the monologue form, and less to recounting ancestral details and minute tracking of her global engagements. But perhaps such assessment requires a separate study, and Mr. Zabel has already done much to preserve at least the skeleton of Ruth Draper's art.

We hope this work will persuade RCA Victor to issue more of Ruth Draper's tapes on LP, so that those who never saw her may hear her and realize more magic than the naked print conveys.

ALBERT T. MARTIN
DePaul University

THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAYHOUSE: LEAVES FROM A THEATRE SCRAPBOOK. By Alice Lewisohn Crowley. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1959; pp. xxiv+266. $5.00.

COMMUNITY THEATRE: IDEA AND ACHIEVEMENT. By Robert E. Gard and Gertrude S. Burley. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1959; pp. x+182. $3.75.

Of these works on community theatre in America, one deals with a theatre of the past, the other with theatres of the present looking toward the future. Alice Lewisohn Crowley's *The Neighborhood Playhouse* traces the development of that renowned New York center of experimental theatre from its inception as an idea during the early years of the second decade of the twentieth century to the final closing of the theatre in 1927. Mrs. Crowley and her sister, Irene Lewisohn, founded the Playhouse in idea and in practice, and served as the vital force behind the never-ending and ever-varying experimental productions. Ballet, poetic adaptation, lyric and conventional drama all came together under the guiding and

educative spirit of the Playhouse. Mrs. Crowley's account is a vital retelling of an exciting and important story in the development of the community theatre movement in the United States. The author's too frequent excursions to places and ideas distant from the story of the Playhouse and her sometimes over-emotional language do not seriously impair its value.

The Gard and Burley volume is a transcription of tape-recorded interviews with thirteen community theatre directors, from John Wray Young of Shreveport, Louisiana, to Eric Salmon of Great Britain (the latter is the only foreign representative). "This book," say the authors in the Foreword, "is not meant to be a history of the [community theatre] movement, but rather an estimate of its state of being in the words of important personalities—all engaged in action." The volume has two major flaws. First, the introductory material is composed of too many broad generalizations on the movement and other developments in American theatre. ("What killed the commercial touring companies . . . was the fact that the tours had no relation, human or aesthetic, to the lives of the people to whom they came.") Second, the volume lacks an evaluation of the conclusions reached by the thirteen directors concerning the development, life, and future of community theatre. The ideas of these men on many of the aspects of theatre operation (playwrights in residence, productions of new and untried plays, the position of the director) are nevertheless valuable to anyone interested in the growth of the theatre arts as a grass-roots movement. To the person seriously considering community theatre as a profession, this compilation is a must.

JOSEPH G. GREEN
University of Louisville

THE BEST PLAYS OF 1958-1959 (THE BURNS MANTLE YEARBOOK). Edited by Louis Kronenberger. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1959; pp. x+405. $6.00.

THEATRE WORLD: SEASON 1958-1959. By Daniel Blum. Philadelphia: Chilton, 1959; pp. 256. $6.00.

THEATRE WORLD ANNUAL (LONDON) NUMBER 10: A PICTORIAL REVIEW OF WEST END PRODUCTIONS WITH A RECORD OF PLAYS AND PLAYERS, 1958-1959. By Frances Stephens. New York: Macmillan, 1959; pp. 176. $5.00.

THE THEATRE ANNUAL, 1959: A PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION AND RESEARCH IN THE ARTS AND HISTORY OF THE THEATRE. Edited by John V. Falconieri and Blanche A. Corin. Cleveland: Western Reserve University Press, 1960; pp. 81. Paper $2.00.

With this forty-second in the *Best Plays* series—originated by Burns Mantle—editor Kronenberger continues the familiar method of recording Broadway fare. The first section includes critical summaries of the seasons: "Broadway" by the editor; "Chicago" by Claudia Cassidy; "London" by Harold Hobson; "Off Broadway" by Henry Hewes. The second section, comprising one-half the book, provides the current Ten Best Plays, wherein Mr. Kronenberger furnishes plot summaries, act by act, interspersed with snatches of dialogue. The remainder of the volume presents delightful drawings by Hirschfeld, various sections of "statistics" (1958-1959 Broadway productions with runs and casts; award winners; necrology), photographs, and several excellent indices.

For those who can't tell the players without a program, Mr. Blum's fifteenth New York annual (1958-1959) surveys Broadway's mart, yet expands its view to plays Off-Broadway, New York City Center season, Phoenix Theatre season, national touring companies, and two Stratford Shakespearean festivals (Connecticut and Ontario).

Complete lists of casts, staffs, and dates as well as some 600 production photographs are included. Although inaccuracies (omissions of names and dates) occur now and again, Mr. Blum's knack in selecting dramatic shots produces an excellent pictorial journal.

Similar to Mr. Blum's New York calendar, Miss Stephens' tenth London review displays with pictures and text the 1958-1959 West End season. Unlike Mr. Blum's exhibit of photographs and production lists, Miss Stephens' book gives critical and pictorial commentary. In addition to a general, seasonal critique—as well as the usual record of casts, staffs, and dates of more than one hundred productions—she has chosen forty-six plays for the following treatment. The first page presents a critical summary, production statistics, and pictures. The remaining pages (from one to five) contain dramatic photographs, and character-plot descriptions, in order of performance. Usually a few lines of dialogue accompany each picture. Thus, picture, plot, and dialogue blend

to form an excellent verbal and visual play review.

Louis Kronenberger's Broadway yearbook, Daniel Blum's New York calendar, and Frances Stephens' London review supply popular records of seasonal theatrical data, whereas Falconieri and Corin's sixteenth annual provides six short articles on theatre—past and present. This year's crop includes informative discussions on Lennox Robinson; *Maria Stuart* in America; The Guarani Theatre of Paraguay; and Hanswurst and the Great Figures of the Old Viennese Comedy. Perhaps the most interesting are Jack Brooking's incisive comparison of Jeanne d'Arc's trial notes with Anouilh's play, *The Lark*, and Jerry Blunt's delightful romp with E. A. Sothern's creation of Dundreary in *Our American Cousin*.

EUGENE K. BRISTOW
Indiana University

MARK TWAIN TONIGHT! By Hal Holbrook. New York: Ives Washburn, 1959; pp. xiii+272. $4.50.

MARK TWAIN AND SOUTHWESTERN HUMOR. By Kenneth S. Lynn. Boston: Little, Brown, 1959; pp. xiii+300. $5.00.

A reading of Hal Holbrook's book should be prefaced by listening to the Columbia record, *Mark Twain Tonight!* on which the author, a thirty-five year old Denison University alumnus, presents an absorbing program of selections from Mark Twain's works. For what Holbrook has done in his volume is to put this recorded material, plus other excerpts, in print. His method is to weave bits and snatches and incidents from various parts of Twain literature into connected discourse. The record and the book complement one another, since Holbrook demonstrates that phrasing, timing, and other aspects of the interpreter's art, founded upon a long study of Twain's method and style, enhance the meaning of the written material.

Twain's genius included more than humor, and Holbrook's volume contains more than entertainment; the selection, for example, of Huck Finn's battle with his conscience about Jim's fate contains some of Twain's fine writing, and listening to its interpretation on the recording is a moving experience.

Whereas Holbrook reveals Mark Twain's genius largely through the interpretative arts, Lynn studies the literary and political backgrounds out of which Twain grew. In rhetorical language, therefore, Lynn's study is mainly though not entirely, a study in invention. The title, *Mark Twain and Southwestern Humor*, needs explanation; it seems to suggest that Twain is to be presented in relation to the somewhat immediate Nevada or California influences that contributed to his development. Lynn begins his treatment, however, earlier in time than one might suppose, and farther from the American Southwest than one might guess; the opening chapters go back to eighteenth-century Virginia and nineteenth-century Georgia, to describe writers like English-schooled William Byrd II and Harvard-schooled Timothy Flint, moving on in time and space to Davy Crockett, Augustus Baldwin Longstreet, William T. Porter, Joseph G. Baldwin, and George Washington Harris. The reader meets such frontier and pioneer types as the Carolina gentleman, the confidence man, the mighty hunter, the happy darky, and the frightful and fearless fighter. As the reader reviews the circumstances out of which these characters develop, and notes the bold and colorful language in which they speak, he begins to see, through Professor Lynn's selectivity, a preview of the kind of narrative and description that Mark Twain later made famous.

Not much actual Mark Twain appears, however, until the reader arrives at page 140; once that page is reached, Twain comes well to the foreground. Lynn comments on *Roughing It*, *Tom Sawyer*, *A Connecticut Yankee*, and other major works. His analysis of the writing of Huckleberry Finn—the masterpiece which its author worked at, set aside, picked up again, threatened to burn, and finally completed after several years—is especially good, though not on the scale of a still more recent volume, Walter Blair's *Mark Twain and Huck Finn*. Casual observations about Mark Twain as a speaker appear, especially an intriguing and entirely believable explanation (pp. 183-184) of the tumultuous reception accorded the General Grant ("The Babies") speech. Whereas one might seek much of the humor in the incongruous picture of General Grant as a baby, trying to get his big toe in his mouth, Lynn sees this happy imagery as a symbol carrying Twain's listeners back to the innocent, irresponsible days before corruption tarnished their hero's presidential administration. Readers of *QJS* will also note references to speakers like Daniel Webster, John Randolph, and Seargent S. Prentiss, and will enjoy reading the comments about Whig influences on Mark Twain's work.

When one puts the book down, he feels better about the title and organization of the book, concluding that here is an addition to critical literature that will be appreciated by the Mark Twain addict and fan.

LOREN REID
University of Missouri

THE EARLY LECTURES OF RALPH WALDO EMERSON. VOLUME I, 1833-1836. Edited by Stephen E. Whicher and Robert E. Spiller. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959; pp. xxvii+545. $12.50.

Emerson's fame as a philosopher rests on evidence as abundant as it is convincing. But the published works have not supported an adequate explanation of his success as a popular lecturer in Boston and Buffalo, Cleveland and Cincinnati, Davenport and Des Moines. The speculation that lyceum audiences gathered to pay respectful homage to a famous litterateur and returned to their homes more impressed than enlightened can hardly be applied to the period between 1832, when he resigned his Unitarian pastorage and began lecturing, and 1841, when he published *Essays, First Series*, his first widely read book.

The twenty lectures in this volume tell us a good deal about the reasons for Emerson's initial success as a lecturer, about his development as a thinker, and about the substance and quality of lyceum addresses in the 1830's. As the first in a projected series of three volumes which will present the extant manuscripts through 1847, this volume includes four lectures on science, five biographical sketches (Michelangelo, Luther, Milton, George Fox, Burke), and eleven addresses on English literature. For the most part, they constitute merely good reporting. Emerson relied heavily on his sources, organized in mechanical fashion, and only infrequently enriched the factual account with original interpretation. The gap between these first ventures on the public platform and the fluid arrangement and bold assertion which characterize his work only a decade later is vast. But the lectures possess a proper freshness and immediacy which the essays necessarily lack. They indicate clearly the desire of lyceum members for interesting instruction, and they demonstrate that Emerson could communicate successfully with a popular audience. The thought moves swiftly. Anecdotes and illustrations calculated to clarify and impress abound. And nearly every page contains some felicitous expression or penetrating observation which lifts the writing from the run-of-the-mill category. Emerson sets Edmund Burke against Demosthenes, for example, and illuminates the essential quality of the oratory of both men: "King Philip said that [Demosthenes'] orations were soldiers. Mr. Burke's might be called, wise men. And as much more effective as is a soldier than a wise man in this world in coming directly to his end, that is the difference between the success of Burke and that of Demosthenes."

Even general readers will find the incipient philosopher an entertaining and rewarding lecturer. Specialists will find that the editors, both well-known Emerson scholars, have treated the manuscripts with intelligence and precision, and that they have provided an elaborate but unobtrusive apparatus which should answer most questions.

HARRY P. KERR
Harvard University

THE SPEECHES OF CHARLES DICKENS. Edited by K. J. Fielding. New York: Oxford Clarendon Press, 1960; pp. xxiv+456. $8.00.

As no author before or since, Charles Dickens succeeded in combining a reputation as both a speaker and a writer. Yet his career as a speaker has gone almost unnoticed. In part, at least, this neglect over the last century has been due to the unavailability of the speeches. Critics and biographers, when they considered his speaking at all, turned for reference to the unauthorized, inaccurate, and incomplete *Speeches Literary and Social*, published by John Camden Hotten in 1870 to capitalize on Dickens' death in that year.

Now Kenneth J. Fielding, one of England's distinguished Dickens scholars, has gathered and edited a new collection of Dickens' speeches. Not only have the collected speeches been revised, carefully edited, and some almost entirely altered, but Fielding has included the eighteen speeches which have appeared from time to time in such periodicals as the *Dickensian* and other speeches which have not been reprinted since their original appearance. The total number included is 115.

The real value of this volume lies not simply in the inclusion of all the known speeches, however helpful that may be, but in determining, as far as is possible, what Dickens really did say each time he spoke. In this formidable task, Fielding has done a superb job. Dickens never wrote out his speeches before they were delivered and only rarely afterward. In only a

few cases did he correct the proofs of reports that were sent to him. For the most part, Fielding has had to rely on the reports in the national newspapers or periodicals. Such reports often varied so widely in accuracy and completeness that one might wonder if he were reading the same speech. In this discouraging business, Fielding has compared and judged and combined reports in a painstaking exercise of scholarly judgment. The results are about as close to what Dickens actually said as we are likely to get.

Fielding has arranged the speeches in chronological order and provided brief headnotes for each speech. In this, he follows the general format of the 1870 edition. The annotating, according to the editor, has been aimed at putting the reader, as far as possible, on equal terms with a fairly well-informed contemporary. This, of course, would be difficult at best, but particularly so in a chronological arrangement which suffers from a certain inflexibility of time. Thus the reader interested in, say, Dickens' quarter of a century relationship with the General Theatrical Fund, will find in this book the fourteen speeches which Dickens presented to this group, and for this he can be properly grateful. But since the speeches are scattered, he is less likely to see their relationship one to another, and the concomitants of time and place and occasion do not appear in quite such sharp focus.

However, the chronological arrangement does show Dickens' career as a public man, and this is Fielding's emphasis. He is less concerned with Dickens as a public speaker. As he states in the introduction, he has edited the speeches as a contribution to Dickens' biography in the belief that a man's public speeches may sometimes be as revealing as his private papers. In an area where objective scholarship has been almost non-existent, Fielding has produced a definitive work.

MELVIN H. MILLER
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

MARK TWAIN-HOWELLS LETTERS: THE CORRESPONDENCE OF SAMUEL L. CLEMENS & WILLIAM DEAN HOWELLS (1869-1910). Edited by Henry Nash Smith and William M. Gibson. Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1960; 2 volumes, pp. xxv+943. $20.00.

Letters between professional writers seldom make the best reading. The celebrated correspondences of the recent past—say, between Bernard Shaw and Ellen Terry, or between Harold Laski and Mr. Justice Holmes—have been the missives between a writer and a member of another profession. Often as not, the published correspondence between writers, including those of the greatest energy—Theodore Dreiser and James T. Farrell present as lively a couple as any—when compared to the authors' other work seems tame, dull even. One professional writer may defer too much to the other's expertise, and deference, one soon sees, is not the stuff of great letter writing. Surely there is nothing deferential about those notable Epistles of Paul to Timothy.

A great exception to this grim state of letters comes, then, with the *Mark Twain-Howells Letters*, a correspondence which spans forty years, now published in its known entirety, and impeccably edited by Professors Henry Nash Smith and William M. Gibson, with the assistance of Frederick Anderson. Thoreau once complained that Emerson would not accept him as an equal, and, for this reason, there could be no chance of friendship between the two. There was profound friendship—abounding in both equality and energy—between Twain and Howells. I do not mean, of course, equality of talent. As a master editor, Howells was the first to avow the uniqueness of Twain's genius; but theirs was a camaraderie created by understanding, suffering, joint work, and, ultimately, the years. The two men shared a series of literary misadventures. One disaster was the failure in 1887 of their play, *Colonel Sellers as a Scientist*. Later, in 1906, the two were frustrated in their attempt to help Maxim Gorky who came to America to raise funds for some Russian revolutionists. Gorky had checked into a series of New York hotels with his mistress and was evicted from them all. Twain told a friend: "Gorky made an awful mistake, Dan. He might as well have come over here in his shirt-tail." On other counts such as their work to reform the copyright laws in the United States and England, however, Twain and Howells achieved some measure of success.

In a remarkably perceptive lecture, "William Dean Howells and the Roots of Modern Taste," delivered at Harvard in 1950, Lionel Trilling, in appreciation of Howells' generosity to our polar literary giants, Mark Twain and Henry James, remarked that any "rumor" of Howells' revival "as a large, significant figure in our literature . . . is surely false." There is nothing in the *Letters* to make one want to modify Mr. Trilling's rumor-scotching. Even as a correspondent, Twain beats Howells at every

turn. But as a friend, Howells comes out as the senior partner. In 1869, before the two men met, Howells wrote an anonymous, surprisingly favorable notice in the *Atlantic* of Twain's first big book, *The Innocents Abroad;* in 1910, soon after Twain's death, Howells put together his earlier Twainiana and his memories in the beautiful tribute, *My Mark Twain.* In the years between, Howells was, in every sense, Twain's best critic, and often his best friend, too. If there were any dependency involved, it appears that time and again Twain sought out Howells with his problems, and asked Howells to read most of his manuscripts. As early as 1875, Twain acknowledged Howells' help when he wrote: "I wish you would promise to read the MS of Tom Sawyer some time, & see if you don't really decide that I am right in closing with him as a boy—& point out the most glaring defects for me. It is a tremendous favor to ask, & I expect you to refuse & would be ashamed to expect you to do otherwise. But the thing has been so many months in my mind that it seems a relief to snake it out. I don't know any other person whose judgment I could venture to take fully & entirely. . . ."

Howells read the manuscript of *Tom Sawyer.* Perhaps. then, William Dean Howells' best work was his creative editing of Mark Twain. The *Letters* attest that for four decades Howells helped Twain to go forward from his early, tossed salad days as "the wild humorist of the Pacific slope," until the end in April, 1910, when Howells could look at his friend Clemens in his coffin and rightly see: "something of a puzzle, a great silent dignity, an assent to what must be from the depths of a nature whose tragical seriousness broke in the laughter which the unwise took for the whole of him. Emerson, Longfellow, Lowell, Holmes—I knew them all and all the rest of our sages, poets, seers, critics, humorists; they were like one another and like other literary men; but Clemens was sole, incomparable, the Lincoln of our literature."

HERBERT FEINSTEIN
San Francisco State College

THEIR BROTHERS' KEEPERS: MORAL STEWARDSHIP IN THE UNITED STATES, 1800-1865. By Clifford S. Griffin. New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1960; pp. xvi+332. $6.00.

William H. Seward, in arguing against the compromise of 1850, spoke eloquently of "the common heritage of mankind, bestowed upon them by their Creator. . . . We are His stewards, and must so discharge our trust as to secure in the highest degree their happiness." So saying, Seward proclaimed the purpose of generations of moral reformers—to save men from the evils of this world.

In the volume at hand, Clifford Griffin seeks to illuminate the efforts of the self-appointed stewards of American morality between 1800 and 1865. Attention focuses chiefly on the leading benevolent reform societies of the era—the American Home Missionary Society, American Bible Society, American Tract Society, American Sunday School Union, Society for the Promotion of Temperance, American Peace Society, and the American Antislavery Society. The first four organizations, seeking to convert men to the ways of Protestant Christianity, would not only save their souls hereafter but help men behave righteously here and now. The latter three societies concentrated on eradicating specific social evils to make American society better.

Indicating the Calvinist origins of the desire of some men to serve as keepers of their brothers' morals, the book concentrates on the organized efforts of nineteenth-century Americans. Succeeding chapters deal with the leaders, forms of organization, methods, appeals, and arguments used by the moral reformers. Griffin sees in the tie between Northern business leaders and the benevolent societies not only a humanitarian concern but also a desire to create an orderly peaceful society and thereby a stable economic order.

The evangelistic "overseers of their brethren's conduct" first tried moral suasion to convert men from sinful ways. By 1840, they shifted their emphasis (accompanied by many internal disputes within the societies themselves) to efforts to legislate morality. The switch became most apparent in the antislavery crusade which absorbed leaders from most of the other reform drives. Political action, as the instrument of moral reform, led to the organization of the Liberty, the Free Soil, and ultimately the Republican party as the agent of morality via legislation. This growth, not a clear-cut, straight line, was, as Griffin clearly shows, beset by many complexities, internal stresses, and digressions such as nativism and free soilism. The moral reform strain in the Republican party the author sees flowing on during the Civil War (whose coming it helped precipitate) into new societies, the Sanitary Commission and the United States Christian

Commission, to guard the morals of the men in blue.

This study is based solidly on extensive research in the manuscript collections, annual reports, and published works of the benevolent societies and their leaders. The author provides a clear analysis and sharp interpretation in showing the origins of reform societies, the relationship of the religious reformers to other social, economic, and political stresses and strains of the period under review. He uses a light touch in handling heavy materials. Here is a workmanlike performance, well organized, clearly presented, and affording a fresh view on one phase of American social history.

DAVID LINDSEY
Los Angeles State College

REPUBLICAN ASCENDANCY, 1921-1933. By John D. Hicks. The New American Nation Series. Edited by Henry Steele Commager and Richard B. Morris. New York: Harper, 1960; xviii+318. $5.00.

In twelve tightly packed chapters, Professor Hicks has produced a tapestry of the Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover eras. This socio-economic history unfolds in a predominantly chronological order as well-chosen frame themes encompass topics and events of particular blocks of time. The expansion of the automotive industry is found most responsible for the tempo and temper of the period. Skillful interlocking of diverse matters promotes a forward movement from the beginning report on the "State of the Union" through chapters entitled "The Progressive Protest," "Prosperity Plus," and "The Diplomacy of Isolation" to the final divisions labeled "Depression Diplomacy" and "The Years of the Locust." Occasionally, the author backtracks adroitly to weave in a stray strand as he touches upon the religion, education, or literature of the period. Nowhere does he treat the arts or fads of the age as fully as Allen in *Only Yesterday* or as Sullivan in *Our Times,* nor does he create their atmosphere of nostalgia. Hicks is more factual. His account is marked by objectivity in interpretation where theirs, though reliable, often veers off into clearly subjective judgments. Though the approach is praiseworthy, the book suffers in places from a compactness which invites sweeping generalization and consequent oversimplification.

The volume is an excellent reference for the student of American public address who is interested in the twenties. It is a good source of clues for a description of the audience, though direct comment on speeches is wanting and comment on speakers is limited to an occasional line. There are brief passages on the rise and influence of the film and radio industries.

The excellent "Bibliographical Essay," critical as well as informative, is a useful guide to closer study of the entire period, of any of the three administrations, of the business boom, depression, prohibition, racketeering, or the Ku Klux Klan.

Republican Ascendancy, 1921-1933 takes its place beside the standard references on the twenties because of its reliability and its complete, if overly-compact, coverage. The passage of time gives it the advantage of objectivity and perspective.

JOHN F. WILSON
Cornell University

THE POLITICS OF NATIONAL PARTY CONVENTIONS. By Paul T. David, Ralph M. Goldman, and Richard C. Bain. Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institution, 1960; pp. xv+592. $10.00.

Most radio, television, and newspaper commentators in recent weeks have devoted time or space to a general condemnation of the convention system of nominating our presidential candidates. This apparently anachronistic and purely American system has been under scrutiny for over a century and a quarter, but no political scientist has yet discovered a better alternative. This is the general conclusion of the three authors of *The Politics of National Party Conventions.*

This book is the natural outgrowth of an earlier five-volume study published by the Brookings Institution, *Presidential Nominating Politics in 1952,* by Paul T. David, Malcolm Moos, and Ralph M. Goldman. The authors draw heavily from the earlier study, but add greatly to the specificity of the discussion of the convention system.

The nineteen chapters in the 1960 study deal with seven major areas: (1) the evolution of the party convention, (2) the channels through which the contenders for nomination reached political prominence, (3) the growing importance of presidential primaries, opinion polls, and the mass media in the nominating process, (4) the centers of leadership of the parties, (5) the convention as a type of representative institution, (6) the voting strategies of contending factions and the development of

convention consensus, and (7) the relation between convention decisions and the popular vote.

The authors are both laudatory and critical in their analysis, but the criticism is attended by constructive recommendations. Most of the recommendations have the common ingredient of a desire to make the conventions more representative.

Numerous tables with statistical information fill the pages, and thirteen tables of general interest are appended. In addition to other valuable appended materials, there is a short and interesting discussion of the applicability of small group research to studies of delegations.

The student of speech will be particularly interested in the chapters dealing with the history of conventions, the leadership centers and roles of the party in power and out, the changing character of nominating campaigns, and the effects of the mass media on the nominating process.

One of the delightful pieces of information found in the study is this discovery: "(1) When harmony attends the nominating process for the in-party, its chances of winning the election are good. (2) When conflict leading to factional victory attends the nominating process for the in-party, its chances of winning the election are poor. (3) When harmony attends the nominating process for the out-party, its chances for winning the election are poor. (4) When conflict leading to factional victory attends the nominating process for the out-party, its chances of winning the election are good." Even though these empirically determined propositions are based on only thirty-one pairs of cases for study, it suggests an exciting campaign in 1960, the result of which will help skew the propositions one way or the other.

For better or worse, the authors conclude that ". . . the continuing contributions made by the conventions to the survival and stability of the American political order are unique, indispensable and, granted our form of Constitution, probably irreplaceable."

David, Goldman, and Bain have combined their talents in producing an interestingly written, well balanced, outstanding scholarly addition to the growing shelves of political studies.

ROBERT C. JEFFREY
Indiana University

THE 1956 PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN. By Charles A. H. Thomson and Frances M. Shattuck. Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institution, 1960; pp. xv+382. $5.00.

This work grew out of the Brookings Institution's five-volume study, *Presidential Nominating Politics in 1952*, by Paul T. David, Malcolm Moos, and Ralph M. Goldman. It attempts to study the election process as an entity, and is thus an American counterpart of the studies of the British general elections conducted by Nuffield College.

Written in a style attractive to the layman, the work is nevertheless well documented. Beginning with the legacy of the 1952 elections, the authors discuss the 1954 congressional campaign and lay the groundwork for 1956. They describe the pre-convention activities, including Stassen's abortive attempts to "dump Nixon," and the bitter primary battles between Kefauver and Stevenson. The authors provide a detailed running account of both the Democratic and the Republican conventions. The election campaigns are carefully reported, and the election is analyzed according to the voting results.

An excellent chapter entitled "Money and Media" reports where the parties got their money and how much they spent on mass media. The two parties spent more than five million dollars on TV alone, with the Republicans concentrating more on the state and local level. The role of labor's spending is also reported.

The division of coverage given to parties and candidates by the press is revealed through headline structuring, news coverage, and reporting of campaign issues. Defense was the issue most frequently mentioned, despite the rating of issue importance by the respective candidates and their parties.

The candidates' speeches during the campaign are reported, but no mention is made of research teams and speech writers. While there is no rhetorical analysis of the speeches, the authors point out the speech issues and their effect. Students of presidential campaign speaking are advised to examine this study.

In a final chapter entitled "1956 in Perspective" the authors criticize Stevenson for failing to continue to "talk sense" to the American people, and for failing to hold to his high standards of political discussion under the stresses of the campaign. Eisenhower is criticized for his failure to use his unexampled popularity and influence to galvanize the na-

tion into a genuine, not merely a verbal, crusade.

This book is recommended reading for students of public address, radio-television, and general speech, as well as for politicians, social scientists, and the general electorate.

RAYMOND YEAGER
Bowling Green State Univerity

THE COMMUNIST PERSUASION: A PERSONAL EXPERIENCE OF BRAINWASHING. By Eleutherius Winance; translated from the French by Emric A. Lawrence. New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1959; pp. xii+239. $3.95.

As one more commentary on the "brainwashing" by Red China, this report by a Catholic priest who tried to continue his religious work after 1949 has more of personal experience and less of theoretical interpretation than its several predecessors—of which Edward Hunter's *Brainwashing in Red China* (1951) was the first and remains the most thorough. As a study in systematic mass persuasion, it lacks the scholarly precision of Merton's *Mass Persuasion*, the comprehensiveness of Johnson's *Battle Against Isolation*, and the categorical finality of Miller's *Propaganda: How and Why it Works*. For these and many another study of mass persuasion, Winance's book is not a replacement—but it is excellent supplementary reinforcement.

While American scholarship is seeking verifiable data on isolated elements of persuasibility (see Hovland and associates), the Communist rulers of China are proceeding with an inclusive and intensive campaign of mass persuasion based upon the premise that they already know what is essential concerning the process.

The Winance book consists of "Technique and Psychology," eleven chapters in ninety pages, analyzing the methods used by the Communists, and "Trial and Expulsion," nine chapters in eighty-five pages, detailing his own experiences, with a "Cause and Effect" third part, indicating his view of the hopelessness of resistance by those anti-Communists remaining in China.

In essence, the persuasive philosophy of the Communists is that everyone will believe what everyone asserts, including the essential ingredient that each individual must himself be forced to join in the assertion. Within this conceptual framework, the main elements of the "brainwashing" are fivefold: (1) Generalized appeals are constantly addressed to idealism (sacrifice, loyalty, brotherhood, etc.) and against the self-seeking ego; (2) an all-pervasive unity of expressed opinion is achieved by means of censorship, governmental dominance of all opinion organs, and encouragement of children to report on any deviant expressions heard within the family circle; (3) an incredibly massive and minute persuasive campaign, including a constant public barrage of propaganda reinforced by compulsory participation by everyone in three four-hour "confessional" discussion sessions each week; (4) systematic breakdown of individual self-trust by emphasis upon the need for repetitive self-denunciation and purgative confessions of error; and (5) the ruthless employment of force and terror (indicated by eighteen million executions—U. S. State Department estimate—and the forced-labor enslavement of millions more) as the only alternatives for those who do not acquiesce.

How well does this kind of persuasion work? Father Winance indicates how insensibly his own determined opposition was undermined; and we have had numerous instances of the perversion of many high intellects and courageous spirits who have been subjected to months or years of this unremitting stress. What the Communists must consider a "harmful side effect" is the development of a near-hysterical tension which cannot be indefinitely maintained; and what we must fear is a resultant fanaticism which leads to ego-identification with an aggressively imperialistic Master-State.

ROBERT T. OLIVER
The Pennsylvania State University

THE PROCESS OF COMMUNICATION. By David K. Berlo. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960; pp. xi+318. $4.25.

In this era of preoccupation with communication and interdisciplinary approaches, Professor Berlo has taken a healthy step forward.

The sub-title, "An Introduction to Theory and Practice," is a harbinger of what is inside. The preface is not unwarranted in predicting that what follows is "essentially . . . concerned with the scope and purpose of communication, the factors involved in the process, and the language in human behavior." This Herculean task is somehow accomplished, but not without considerable harsh pruning.

In building a communication theory, the author has borrowed liberally from experimental and social psychology, sociology, linguistics, anthropology, and philosophy. Mass

communication studies are also utilized. There are acknowledgments to rhetoric and, although perhaps not enough to satisfy the classicist in speech, there are enough to suggest the author is cognizant of its importance. "Redundancy" and "entropy" are introduced, but information theory is never mentioned. A similar lack of acknowledgment obtains for general semantics, although some of its terms are presented.

The labels of Shannon and Weaver are adapted to fashion a model of the human communication process (Source-Message-Channel-Receiver) which "emphasizes the importance of a thorough understanding of human behavior as a prerequisite to communication behavior." In order that the reader may be helped to achieve this understanding, he is introduced in separate chapters to the basic concepts of learning, interaction, social systems, meaning and communication, observations and judgments, inferences, and definition.

The author writes with a lucidity which would become the most effective expository speaker. In fact, the style suggests that the manuscript might have been dictated. Short sentences, non-technical language, generous use of reiteration, and frequent summaries elicit the reaction that here is one who can communicate about communication. However, too little reference is made to relevant research. A much more extensive bibliography might have made up for this imbalance.

The Process of Communication is designed primarily for those "who are engaged in or are preparing for professional communication work in the public media or elsewhere." It will be valuable also in communication seminars (notwithstanding the paucity of research studies included) and might profitably be assigned as outside reading in the beginning speech course. It is not in the same class with Cherry's *On Human Communication* and does not pretend to be. Cherry's approach is much more technical and the language level is much more difficult.

DWIGHT L. FRESHLEY
Vanderbilt University

THE IDEA OF FREEDOM: A DIALECTICAL EXAMINATION OF THE CONCEPTION OF FREEDOM. By Mortimer J. Adler. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1958; pp. xxvii+689. $7.50.

The Idea of Freedom may mark a major "break-through" in shifting the activity of philosopners from logic to dialogue. Philosophers (with other liberal arts academicians, have felt that they have not gained the acceptance accorded to scientists in recent years. The scientist's *certainty* was contrasted unfavorably with the historic *lack of agreement* among philosophers. Philosophers met but their philosophies did not.

With the work of the Institute for Philosophical Research in San Francisco, philosophy seems to turn from the method of logic to the new method of dialectic. Mortimer J. Adler, supervisor of the Institute, has been a principal leader in the effort which culminated in the publication of this volume. His recreation of dialectic was crystallized from his *Dialectic* published in 1927, when he was lecturing on psychology at Columbia University. He wrote then that ancient dialectic was "neither a method of investigation nor one of demonstration. It was a method of argument, of controversy, and disputation."

The present use of dialectic is not quite the dialectic of Plato, for Plato directs the dialogue to conclusions he regarded as achieving truth. Fruitful thought arises in the course of intellectual conversation. The "new" dialectic is neutral and the twentieth-century scholars do not participate in the dialogue. This modern use of dialectic as a method employs all other methods of finding truth, but the dialectician sits on the bench as judge and makes no attempt to direct it toward any pre-determined goal. Plato's philosopher-king was to have his educational preparation culminate with consummate ability in the use of dialectic, the pinnacle of all sciences. Cicero's youthful and future leader was polished by the trivium of grammar, rhetoric, or dialectic. The first two were necessary for participation in the third. But by the time of Francis Bacon, the rise of science had placed a premium on logic. In induction and deduction, or the thinking of the single mind, the business of conversing with others was considered unreliable, unscientific, and too much in the area of the probable. Within this realm of probability *truth* is unlikely of discovery, whereas the scientist believes that he has found it.

As an associate editor for *Great Ideas, A Syntopicon,* dealing with the 102 basic ideas of the Western World, Adler, with the help of one hundred scholars, took seven years to complete a fifty-four volume "index-index." Now the San Francisco panel of twelve scholars under his supervision has completed a five-year study of freedom, *one* of the 102 ideas,

which reverses the historical diversity of philosophers.

PAUL CARMACK
The Ohio State University

BRIEFLY NOTED

THE BASES OF SPEECH. By Giles Wilkeson Gray and Claude Merton Wise. (Third edition.) New York: Harper, 1959; pp. xiv+562. $6.00.

Approximately a quarter of a century has passed since Professors Gray and Wise wrote *The Bases of Speech*. The third edition now is available. The most obvious change is the improvement in attractiveness. The cover, stock, and illustrations are of the excellent quality the book deserves.

The goal of the book, to give its reader a "broad understanding of the foundations" of speech, is constant. Only the academic level of its intended readers is changed. Now designed for advanced undergraduate and graduate students, the third edition appears to reflect growth of knowledge rather than a change in approach. The information has not been broadened as much as it has been deepened.

The format is the same. Each chapter presents a "basis" of speech. The nine bases discussed are social, physical, physiological, neurological, phonetic, linguistic, psychological, genetic, and semantic. The reader may wonder by what criteria the bases were separated. Some divisions are more apparent than others. The three f's of speech science, physics, physiology, and phonetics are segregated neatly, done thoroughly, and illustrated beautifully. The same is true of the chapter on neurology, which has had the most extensive rewriting. The criteria used to separate the social, psychological, and the part of the genetic basis which deals with the development of speech by the infant are not clear. The remainder of the genetic basis in which origin of language is explored, appears to have closer kinship with linguistics than with the aforementioned portion of the chapter.

Many years of study and teaching are brought to bear upon the book's contents. With the wealth of information presented, the writers have included germane and astute observations. Such commentary usually embraces two detractors: disputable opinions and a tendency towards digression. The text has not escaped entirely from either. An example of the former is found in the authors' approach to general semantics. Examples of the latter are not frequent and are interesting enough to add to the book's excellent readability.

If this review seems more critical than commendatory, it is only because the reviewer felt no need to supplement the fine reputation this book has had throughout the years. No single volume has served the student of oral communication more thoroughly in the past. And the latest edition has improved upon its predecessors.

EDMUND C. NUTTALL
Cornell University

FUNDAMENTALS OF PUBLIC SPEAKING. By Donald C. Bryant and Karl R. Wallace. (Third edition.) New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1960; pp. xii+587. $5.50.

Bryant and Wallace offer a carefully revised, content-oriented successor to their editions of 1947 and 1953. The new edition retains the rationale that competent speechmaking proceeds from firm grasp of speech fundamentals as well as knowledge of the dimensions of social behavior. Early consideration of the basic unit of discourse—statement and its development—facilitates student progress to the rostrum, and provides background for the authors' focus upon informative and persuasive speeches as main types of practical public address.

Readers will approve the augmented sections on language and style, ethics and uses of persuasion, amplification (including fresh material on visual aids), the provocative guides to further reading, and sixteen speech texts with perceptive advice for their study. Delivery receives sound though comparatively brief treatment. If some teachers miss the usual end-of-chapter exercises, most of them probably prefer their own invention or supplemental workbooks with varieties of instructional aids.

Fundamentals of Public Speaking may have sparse appeal to those only casually interested in speech improvement or to shoppers after tidy formulas for success. This latest edition has been designed deliberately for "college students and other mature learners," whose respect it will command.

JAMES H. MCBATH
University of Southern California

PRACTICAL SPEECH FUNDAMENTALS. By Eugene E. White. New York: Macmillan, 1960; pp. x+519. $5.75.

Whether an instructor stresses the elements of speech or the forms of speech or a com-

bined approach in his fundamentals course, he should find Eugene White's *Practical Speech Fundamentals* adaptable to his needs. This comprehensive textbook is a revision and expansion of the author's *Practical Public Speaking*, written in collaboration with Clair Henderlider in 1954.

Divided into four parts—An Overview, The Speaker, The Audience, and Basic Forms of Communication—the book covers the elements of speech and factors of a speech situation in the first three parts, and public speaking, oral reading, and group discussion in the fourth part (about half of the book).

Notable chapters in the first half of the book are those on language, voice, pronunciation (including phonetics), and audience analysis. In Part IV, the six chapters on public speaking are excellent, particularly in the areas of organization and developmental materials. The two chapters on the principles and forms of oral reading are limited in scope and depth, but the two chapters on the principles and forms of discussion are remarkable in their full and precise coverage.

Exceptional in organization and clarity, the book contains such special features as chapter summaries, suggested exercises and assignments, documentation of sources, and some visual aids. The author's personal style and abundant use of examples and illustrations make readable and vivid a book that might easily be dull because it covers so much so concisely—and so soundly.

ROBERT R. CROSBY
Ohio Wesleyan University

PRACTICAL METHODS IN SPEECH. By Harold Barrett. New York: Henry Holt, 1959; pp. x+326. $3.75.

SPEECH HANDBOOK. By Harry G. Barnes. (Second edition.) New York: Prentice-Hall, 1959; pp. 161. Paper $2.25.

A GUIDE TO EFFECTIVE SPEAKING. By Elbert R. Moses, Jr. (Revised edition.) New York: Vantage Press, 1957; pp. xii+114. $2.95.

Practical Methods in Speech is intended for college classes, but it also can be used in high schools. The text is divided into three basic parts: (1) Rudimentary Methods, (2) Complementary Methods, and (3) Supplementary Methods. The latter part contains directions for specific forms of speechmaking and material on group discussion, parliamentary law, and reading aloud. Model speeches and short "readings in speech" are added in an appendix. Although the book is comprehensive, some parts are stronger than others. The main values of the book are: a strong plea urging the student to accept a moral responsibility for his public utterances; a relaxed readable style; a good chapter on listening; a division of speeches into three types (inform, entertain, persuade) which avoids the bothersome fine distinctions sometimes raised by those who discern innumerable basic types; advocacy of an organizational plan which is simple, functional, Aristotelian.

Although Mr. Barrett writes well, his chapter on style does not give the student much specific help other than to describe some of the characteristics of a good style. How the student is to acquire these characteristics is not made clear. The logical forms of argument (deduction, induction, causal relationships) should have been presented earlier. The discussion of evidence, particularly of statistical and authoritative evidence, should be amplified. The material on parliamentary law is too brief to be very useful. Despite these problems, the book is a better than average effort of its type.

Harry G. Barnes' revised *Handbook*, completed after his death by Donald Streeter, should prove to be useful in short courses, but it must be supplemented by careful teaching. It often describes excellences without demonstrating how they are to be attained. This is most noticeable in the material on "formulation of thought." Then, too, the organization causes many redundancies in discussing "basic processes," "essential skills of speech making," and "essential skills of reading aloud."

Elbert R. Moses' *Guide to Effective Speaking* costs $2.95, excessive for a manual of 114 pages, especially when the last 47 pages consist of a collection of student outlines and speeches. Fourteen pages are given to a sketchy discussion of parliamentary law. Nine more are consumed by "usable quotations." This leaves but little space for a discussion of speechmaking. As Moses admits, ". . . it may be necesary for the student to refer to other materials to get a more detailed answer."

LLOYD WATKINS
Ohio University

SKILL IN READING ALOUD. By Joseph F. Smith and James R. Linn. New York: Harper, 1960; pp. 448. $5.75.

Skill in Reading Aloud is intended for a one-semester beginning course in the oral interpre-

tation of literature. Its purpose is to help the non-literary person to read more critically, to experience more deeply, and to communicate more effectively. The authors have accomplished their purpose. They show the student what the problem is, what his resources are, how to use his resources, and why. The style is informal, with a warm, personal, friendly, albeit scholarly approach, that makes evident in every word the writers' interest in the student, in literature, and in reading aloud.

This is a handsome book, inside and out. The page was designed to make reading easy for the student (and the professor), as the various elements are set off typographically. Textual discussion, literary analysis, illustrative selections, and material to be read aloud are identified in the format. It contains a cross reference system so that many practice materials are discussed or assigned more than once. Thus the student encounters the same selection from two or three viewpoints, and sees that the problems of interpretation are interrelated, that practice in reading aloud is cumulative.

Skill in Reading Aloud is a challenging and stimulating textbook which establishes sound principles for oral interpretation, provides an exceptional amount of new, in addition to standard reading material for the student to use, and more varied and helpful exercise material than in any similar text. The result is, in the opinion of the reviewer, the most effective and useful textbook for the beginning class in oral interpretation.

MELVIN R. WHITE
Brooklyn College

ORAL INTERPRETATION HANDBOOK. By ANNE SIMLEY. Minneapolis, Minn.: Burgess, 1960; pp. iii+62. $2.00.

Oral Interpretation Handbook should be of interest to those concerned with teaching students to participate in speech festivals. Published in a pocket size, spiral edition, it is designed to give specific suggestions to students and teachers who have not had the benefit of special class work in interpretation, but who must direct speech activities, especially in contests such as those sponsored by high school leagues in many states.

In a concise, easy-to-read style, Miss Simley first defines oral interpretation and then discusses its basic techniques. Judges at festivals are often confronted with many questions from participants and teachers regarding their brief suggestions. In the rush, they seldom have time to explain fully. Miss Simley gives that fuller explanation, and many judges will be pleased to refer contestants and their teachers to *Oral Interpretation Handbook*.

EDNA GILBERT
State Teachers College
Minot, North Dakota

THE ANNOUNCER'S HANDBOOK. By Ben Graf Henneke and Edward S. Dumit. New York: Rinehart, 1959; pp. x+293. $4.00.

This is a new up-to-date version of a 1948 book entitled, *The Radio Announcer's Handbook*. As the preface indicates, "a word has been dropped from the title and a medium added to the text."

There are two parts; one deals with the announcer's work, his qualifications, his skills, and his role as an *ad lib* performer; the other is devoted to exercises. Material selected for Part 2 is especially well suited for announcer training and includes audition copy, conversational drills using public service announcements, commercials, TV voice over, and program promotion. The exercises are organized so that the student announcer is introduced to more and more difficult tasks as he progresses in the book. The student is also given practice in phrasing, mood creation, pronunciation, and vocabulary drill. There are sections containing straight news, feature material, commentary, and specialized continuity. All areas and all levels of difficulty are considered.

Messrs. Henneke and Dumit have set about to provide a workable text for the training of future announcers, and in this reviewer's opinion they have done an admirable job.

JAMES E. LYNCH
The Ohio State University

TV TAPE COMMERCIALS. By Harry Wayne McMahan. New York: Hastings House, 1960; pp. 110. $4.50.

For the serious student of television production, this book will serve only as a superficial treatment of video tape techniques and of the changes that tape has effected in the television industry. The author, an administrative and creative consultant to advertising agencies, is concerned mainly with the application of video tape to television commercials. The material, presented in a general and non-technical fashion, will be of value to persons particularly interested in the planning and writing of tel-

evision commercials. Those desiring detailed information concerning video tape operational procedures and production techniques will have to look elsewhere.

HERBERT SELTZ
Indiana University

MODERN VERSE IN ENGLISH, 1900-1950. Edited by David Cecil and Allen Tate. New York: Macmillan, 1959; pp. 688. Text $3.75, Trade $5.00.

This anthology includes a generous selection of modern verse from Hardy and Dickinson to Gascoyne and Wilbur. I count 524 poems by 116 British and American poets. The book is efficiently designed and printed. It is small enough to be handled without difficulty by the oral interpreter and, though poems and poets follow closely one upon the other, the print is clear and large enough to read easily.

Concerning content, most instructors will be mildly pleased by this latest item in the stock of anthologies of modern verse. Most of the poets selected are represented in other anthologies by pretty much the same poems which are included here. But a few poets, and several poems, will strike the reader as fresh and legitimate additions to the standard lists. Accompanying the poems are short introductory essays and notes, on British poetry by Lord Cecil and on American poetry by Mr. Tate. Lord Cecil's notes provide brief and frequently illuminating reviews of central aspects of work by the British poets.

DON GEIGER
University of California, Berkeley

THE WILSON ADMINISTRATION AND CIVIL LIBERTIES, 1917-1921. By Harry N. Scheiber. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1960; pp. ix+60. Paper $1.25.

This revision of a master's thesis in history at Cornell University presents an unflattering picture of how civil liberties were treated by Woodrow Wilson and his Cabinet. The repressive policies of Attorney General Thomas W. Gregory and his successor, A. Mitchell Palmer, and of Postmaster General Albert S. Burleson, receive caustic, detailed, and carefully documented criticism.

Given scant credit for disapproving privately the most repressive of his subordinates' actions, Wilson is criticized for his "abdication of personal responsibility" in the protection of civil liberties. Scheiber quotes Wilson's speeches and letters attacking the patriotism of socialists, pacifists, German- or Irish-Americans, the I.W.W., "thus contributing significantly to . . . the atmosphere of suspicion and intolerance in which conformity was made a test of loyalty and nativism and repression flourished."

Even the Commander in Chief finds it hard to control public intolerance in wartime. Wilson failed to try; he even fanned the fire with inflammatory utterances. And after the war the League monopolized his attention to the exclusion of civil liberties. Scheiber notes Wilson's refusal to grant amnesty to political prisoners such as Eugene V. Debs and makes Wilson responsible for at least an indirect assist to Palmer's "Red Scare."

GREGG PHIFER
Florida State University

FREUDIANISM AND THE LITERARY MIND. By Frederick J. Hoffman. (Second edition.) Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1957; pp. xii+350. $5.00.

In this sympathetic account of the impact of Freudianism upon twentieth-century writers, Frederick J. Hoffman of the University of Wisconsin examines in detail influences upon James Joyce, D. H. Lawrence, Sherwood Anderson, Waldo Frank, Franz Kafka, Thomas Mann, F. Scott Fitzgerald, and others. Included also are a lucid essay on psychoanalytical theory, a delightful account of "the great Freudian pollution" of Greenwich Village, a commentary on the "extension of Freudian techniques to literary criticism," and a helpful bibliography. Writers and critics, says Professor Hoffman, sometimes applied psychoanalytical techniques with "more facility than judgment"; and gradually "the popular mind accepted psychoanalysis—though it may never have heard of Freud." The Viennese scientist, a "man of letters," provided a new vocabulary to describe man's foibles and "a new fictional type," the psychoanalyst.

Drug therapy may one day supersede Freud's methods of treating mental illness; his "very complex and provocative influence" on literature and thought may be more enduring.

R. G. G.

JOHN DEWEY: DICTIONARY OF EDUCATION. Edited by Ralph B. Winn, with a foreword by John Herman Randall, Jr. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959; pp. x+150. $3.75.

"Dictionary" in the title of this book is a metaphor (or a misnomer), for its contents

do not consist in definitions of a variety of parts of speech pertinent to education. In compiling this observance of the centenary of Dewey's birth, Mr. Winn has combed the Great Pragmatist's writings (whether or not the complete canon I am incompetent to say) for "quotable quotes," which he has arranged under some 165 nouns, ranging from "abstraction" to "youth." The shortest entry appears to be the one under "deception": "No one is deceived so readily as a person under strong emotion" (there are cross references to "Desire 1" and "Reality 2"). Mr. Winn gives the greatest amount of space (nearly six pages) to "school," with excerpts from eight sources.

Many of the epigrams and *obiter dicta* are provocative; others are merely provoking. It is news to no one that Dewey is often ambiguous; proponents of the most widely variant views might cite identical texts in support of diametrically opposed opinions.

Dictionary of Education is interesting enough for browsing, but I feel that as a reference work it will be of limited value to the general user. Assuming the possibility of such a paradox, this "dictionary" is at once too general and too highly specialized to be of great interest to anyone who (however much he may respect Dewey's contributions to philosophy and education) does not qualify as a member of the cult.

HENRY L. MUELLER
University of Illinois

HOW ADULTS LEARN. By J. R. Kidd. New York: Association Press, 1959; pp. 324. $4.75.

Here is an examination of the most important participant in the whole field of adult education, the adult learner. In a single, pleasantly written volume we are offered a synthesis of almost fifty years of research in the fields of adult intelligence, motivation, and psychology. The material is handled with insight and with an appreciation of what the teacher of adults needs to know in order to prepare himself for the task of facing a group of mature learners. Mr. Kidd also presents data which will enable most adult students to face the learning situation with equanimity and confidence. The reader is given answers to questions such as: *Can adults learn? How well can adults learn? Do adults want to learn? How can the attention of adults be secured for learning? How can adults be helped to become continuing learners?*

The author ranges over such matters as the relationship of various philosophies of education and theories of learning to adult education. He also touches briefly upon the value and use of role-playing, psychodrama, group discussion, and the case method in teaching adults.

All of the materials presented are based on research studies. Excellent bibliographies and reading lists are provided for those interested in further study.

How Adults Learn is the best single volume introduction to adult students, their abilities, their problems, and their promise that this reviewer has had the pleasure of reading. I recommend it for all members of the speech profession who are engaged in adult education activities.

FRANK E. X. DANCE
University of Kansas

APHASIA HANDBOOK FOR ADULTS AND CHILDREN. By Aleen Agranowitz and Milfred Riddle McKeown; Foreword by J. M. Nielsen. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Edward Brothers, 1959; pp. viii+103. Paper $3.25.

In the first seventy-six pages of this paperback book, the authors present a detailed description of methods for language retraining on the adult level. The presentation is singularly effective: most pages are printed in two columns, with the right-hand column containing sample exercises and the left-hand column containing remarks and suggestions for their use. A worthwhile contribution to the literature on speech rehabilitation for aphasic adults, this book presents a wealth of information, based on clinical experience, some of which has not been published previously. It may well be placed in the hands of the family or friends of the aphasic patient to supplement the professional help available or to provide direction where such help is minimal or nonexistent.

Part Two on the training of aphasic children is twenty-two pages in length. The authors define an aphasic child as "one who *fails to develop* adequate language because of brain injury occurring before birth, at birth, or in the early years of life," as well as one who may "sustain a *loss of language* due to brain injury." An adequate evaluation of language behavior includes a discussion of auditory recognition, motor speech function, ability to name, and ability to formulate and use propositional speech.

The authors feel that therapy for an aphasic child is a "happy combination of a simple,

structured, permissive atmosphere." Constant reference is made to the "emotional problems" of aphasic children stemming from inhibited language development. Thus, there is a need to provide play therapy or a means of expression for these children through other media, such as clay and finger paint.

Basically the authors advocate an approach to aphasia in children similar to that for aphasia in adults. That is, every approach for building associations is offered: visual, auditory, tactile, or kinesthetic. Auditory training is considered basic to all language retraining. Specific techniques are discussed under "Therapy for Children at Concept Building Level," "Therapy for Children at Early Language Level," and "Therapy for Children with Residual Aphasia Defects." As the child progresses from the first to the last level, he is able to tolerate less free play and more structured procedures during one session.

Part Two on the training of aphasic children lacks the detail and evident mystery of information apparent in Part One on aphasia in adults. Therapy is discussed in more general terms and includes procedures which might be considered applicable to children who have failed to develop language regardless of etiology.

MARGARET L. STOICHEFF
State University of Iowa

THE MEANING OF SHAKESPEARE. By Harold C. Goddard. Chicago: Phoenix Books, University of Chicago Press, 1960; 2 vols.; pp. 394 and 247. Paper $1.95 each.

Harold Goddard's *The Meaning of Shakespeare* was first published by the University of Chicago Press in 1951, just after Goddard's death. Since that time, both the acclaim of critics and the sale of the book have led the press now to make the work available to a wider public in a cheaper edition.

This interpretation of Shapespeare is based upon thirty years of teaching courses in Shakespeare at Swarthmore, in which Professor Goddard immersed himself in the plays and read endlessly in Shakespeare criticism, and in literature generally, particularly in the Russian writers whom he quotes so aptly. He writes in a distinguished and non-academic style, and keeps significant human problems in mind.

Years before the appearance of this book, J. W. McKail wrote in *The Approach to Shakespeare*, "Shakespeare sets life before us and leaves us to draw our own conclusions; he passes no judgments, he draws no morals, he has no obsessions." Since then the retreat to aestheticism among certain critics has led to an insistence that since Shakespeare drew no conclusions about life, we must do the same, and think only about his art. Harold Goddard thinks with more illumination about Shakespeare's art than most critics, but he does draw conclusions of his own about life as portrayed by Shakespeare. For example, he finds in *Measure for Measure* a searching study of the effect of power on character. He sees in plays often interpreted as jingoistic glorifications of war, impressive examples of the futility of force. In many cases of the perpetual war between the generations he sees tributes to the power of love, and again and again he reminds us that Shakespeare portrays the power of the poetic imagination to rule the world.

All this has produced a variety of reactions among critics. The editor of the University of Chicago Press in accepting the manuscript enthusiastically wrote that he did not know there was a man alive with such an intellectual and imaginative sweep in these days when critics write more and more about less and less. But a number of professional critics objected to Goddard's subjectivity and referred to him with some contempt as a moralist. Those critics who are concerned with a reading public more than with graduate students in a university, have found Goddard's volume a book that is certain to hold a permanent place in the literature of Shakespeare criticism, a book to recommend to actors who want to understand what they are trying to present on the stage, a book for fireside readers, a book which, like Shakespeare himself, speaks according to the wit of its companions.

Harold Goddard did not claim to have discovered *the* meaning of Shakespeare. The title was his publishers. He has written an eloquent introductory chapter on the need for every man to create his own Shakespeare, just as an orchestra conductor reads himself into the symphony he is conducting. And there will always be endless arguments about the relation of the conductor to the composer. But the response to this book shows that Harold Goddard is already recognized as one of the great conductors of the Shakespeare symphony.

EVERETT HUNT
Swarthmore College, Emeritus

ENGLISH'S OPERA HOUSE. By William George Sullivan. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1960; pp. 45. Paper $1.00.

These notes of the late William George Sullivan have been gathered by Miss Gayle Thornbrough, an editor of the Indiana Historical Society. Sullivan, frequently in the audience—and at least once upon the stage—of the English Opera House, focuses on the highlights of the Indianapolis theatre and the colorful family who built it. Erected in 1880 by the Democratic vice-presidential candidate that year, William H. English, the Opera House presented most of the great stars during its sixty-six year history, including Edwin Booth, William Gillette, Lawrence Barrett, Sarah Bernhardt, Maude Adams, and all the Barrymores.

Sullivan was fortunate to have access to the English family scrapbooks and program files which are now deposited at the Indiana Historical Society Library. The pamphlet's only fault is that it is much too short. Despite the material available, Sullivan provides only a cursory glance at this institution which in its day was one of the finest theatres in the Middle West.

RICHARD K. KNAUB
Indiana University

SPEECHREADING, A GUIDE FOR LAYMEN. By Adam J. Sortini. Washington, D. C.: The Volta Bureau, 1958; pp. x+50. $1.00.

The assumption the author of this booklet makes is that since qualified professional people are not available to teach lipreading to the hearing handicapped children in many localities, parents and regular classroom teachers must assume responsibility for training these children as best they can. This manual contains condensed and simplified information concerning lipreading, complemented with specific lessons that might be followed by the parent or classroom teacher in this role.

The layman will also find a list of books for further guidance, as well as brief discussions of hearing losses, how a teacher might find hearing handicapped children in the classroom, and how a hearing aid ought to be maintained. It is an interesting attempt to alleviate the shortage of trained personnel.

VINCENT H. KNAUF
Indiana University

BOOKS RECEIVED

THE TRAGEDY OF KING LEAR. By William Shakespeare. Edited by Alfred Harbage. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1958; pp. 180. Paper $0.65.

TWELFTH NIGHT; OR, WHAT YOU WILL. By William Shakespeare. Edited by Charles T. Prouty. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1958; pp. 121. Paper $0.50.

THE MERCHANT OF VENICE. By William Shakespeare. Edited by Brents Stirling. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1959; pp. 126. Paper $0.50.

A MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM. By William Shakespeare. Edited by Madeleine Doran. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1959; pp. 119. Paper $0.50.

AS YOU LIKE IT. By William Shakespeare. Edited by Ralph M. Sargent. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1959; pp. 126. Paper $0.50.

THE TRAGEDY OF RICHARD THE THIRD. By William Shakespeare. Edited by G. Blakemore Evans. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1959; pp. 176. Paper $0.65.

THE TEMPEST. By William Shakespeare. Edited by Northrop Frye. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1959; pp. 112. Paper $0.50.

THE HISTORY OF TROILUS AND CRESSIDA. By William Shakespeare. Edited by Virgil K. Whitaker. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1958; pp. 155. Paper $0.65.

NEW ENGLISH DRAMATISTS. Three Plays introduced and edited by E. Martin Browne. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1959; pp. 238. Paper $0.95.

THE RULES OF THE GAME. THE LIFE I GAVE YOU. LAZARUS. By Luigi Pirandello. Introduced and edited by E. Martin Browne. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1960; pp. 219. Paper $0.95.

THREE IRISH PLAYS. Introduced and edited by E. Martin Browne. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1960; pp. 236. Paper $0.95.

PLAYS. By Anton Chekhov. Translated and with an Introduction by Elisaveta Fen. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1959; pp. 453. Paper $1.25.

THE MASTER BUILDER AND OTHER PLAYS. By Henrik Ibsen. Translated by Una Ellis-Fermor. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1959; pp. 376. Paper $0.95.

FAUST, PART TWO. By Goethe. Translated with an Introduction by Philip Wayne. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1959; pp. 288. Paper $0.95.

THE PENGUIN BOOK OF FRENCH VERSE: SIXTEENTH TO EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES. Introduced and edited by Goeffrey Brereton with plain prose translations of each poem. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1958; pp. 329. Paper $0.95.

THE PENGUIN BOOK OF FRENCH VERSE: THE TWENTIETH CENTURY. Introduced and edited by Anthony Hartley with plain prose translations of each poem. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1959; pp. 323. Paper $1.25.

THE PENGUIN BOOK OF CANADIAN VERSE. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by Ralph Gustafson. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1958; pp. 255. Paper $0.85.

ESSAYS. By Michel de Montaigne. Translated with an Introduction by J. M. Cohen. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1958; pp. 406. Paper $0.95.

FALL OF THE ROMAN REPUBLIC: SIX LIVES. By Plutarch. Translated by Rex Warner. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1958; pp. 320. Paper $0.95.

PIERS THE PLOUGHMAN. By William Langland. Translated into modern English with an Introduction by J. F. Goodridge. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1959; pp. 366. Paper $0.95.

THE MISANTHROPE AND OTHER PLAYS. By Molière. Translated with an Introduction by John Wood. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1959; pp. 282. Paper $0.95.

SIR GAWAIN AND THE GREEN KNIGHT. Translated with an Introduction by Brian Stone. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1959; pp. 144. Paper $0.85.

THE TWO FREEDOMS. By Jon Silkin. New York: Macmillan, 1958; pp. 48. $2.50.

OUT IN THE OPEN. Poems by Katherine Hoskins. New York: Macmillan, 1959; pp. 99. Paper $1.25.

SCRIMSHAW. By Winfield Townley Scott. New York: Macmillan, 1959; pp. viii+72. Paper $1.25.

GRAFFITI. By Ramon Guthrie. New York: Macmillan, 1959; pp. viii+72. Paper $1.00.

THE SELF-MADE MAN AND OTHER POEMS. By Reed Whittemore. New York: Macmillan, 1959; pp. viii+79. Paper $1.25.

THE CROW AND THE HEART, 1946-1959. By Hayden Carruth. New York: Macmillan, 1959; pp. x+93. Paper $1.50.

WALLS AND DISTANCES. By David Galler. New York: Macmillan, 1959; pp. viii+64. Paper $1.00.

THE CHICAGO HAYMARKET RIOT: ANARCHY ON TRIAL. (Selected Source Materials for College Research Papers.) Edited by Bernard R. Kogan. Boston: D. C. Heath, 1959; pp. xiv+114. Paper $1.40.

MR. SPECTATOR'S LONDON. (Selected Source Material for College Research Papers.) Edited by John H. Sutherland. Boston: D. C. Heath, 1959; pp. x+118. Paper $1.40.

CALIFORNIA GOLD. (Selected Source Materials for College Research Papers.) Edited by Edwin R. Bingham. Boston: D. C. Heath, 1959; pp. x+117. Paper $1.40.

MARK TWAIN'S HUCKLEBERRY FINN. (Problems in American Civilization.) Edited with an Introduction by Barry A. Marks. Boston: D. C. Heath, 1959; pp. xii+108. $1.50.

EVERYMAN AND MEDIEVAL MIRACLE PLAYS. Edited with an Introduction by A. C. Cawley. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1959; pp. xxii+266. Paper $1.35.

TWO CLASSICAL COMEDIES: THE BIRDS BY ARISTOPHANES, THE BROTHERS MENAECHMUS BY PLAUTUS. Translated and edited by Peter D. Arnott. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1958; pp. xvi+106. Paper $0.45.

CHORAL SPEAKING IS FUN: POETRY ARRANGED FOR CHORAL SPEAKING. (Book One for Primary Grades.) By Letitia Raubicheck. New York: Noble & Noble, 1955; pp. 44. Paper $0.75.

CHORAL SPEAKING IS FUN: POETRY ARRANGED FOR CHORAL SPEAKING. (Book Two for Intermediate Grades.) By Letitia Raubicheck. New York: Noble & Noble, 1958; pp. 62. Paper $1.00.

THE SEVEN ENGLISH SPEECH TONES ANALYZED AND IDENTIFIED WITH MUSICAL TONES AND CHINESE SPEECH TONES. By Jee Sane Woo. New York: William-Frederick, 1959; pp. 29. Paper $1.50.

SHOP TALK

ROBERT L. SCOTT, *Editor*

PRESIDENTIAL PREFERENTIAL POLL

The faithful SAA member, beseiged on every side by election year rhetoric in all its modern accouterment of press releases, polls, pundits' predictions, and interminable commentary, may be shocked to find this department seemingly in the business of purveying ordinary election year commodities. But ST's poll is different. In the first place, we are embarrassingly behind times. Our poll is pre-convention! In addition, our poll was not intended to give a basis for predicting the outcome of the conventions or the elections (which is an excellent statement to make in view of the poll's results). What is it all about?

With a pile of purloined paper on hand, the knowledge that the dauntless carriers of our mail would take an extra sheet in the four cent stamped envelopes which were about to be posted, and an excessive amount of unreleased tensions which he felt his colleagues must share, ST determined to take a poll. Since he had been resolutely ignored by Messrs. Gallup, Roper, *et al.*, who are obviously interested in average citizens, he decided to poll unaverage citizens—450 department chairmen who were about to receive his semi-annual "call for news." This fortunate, carefully selected sample was asked to respond to six questions:

1. Who is the better public speaker? Richard Nixon or Nelson Rockefeller?
2. Whom would you prefer to have as Republican nominee for the presidency? (Same choice as above.)
3. Who is the best public speaker? Lyndon Johnson, John Kennedy, Adlai Stevenson, or Stuart Symington?
4. Whom would you prefer to have as Democratic nominee for the presidency? (Same choice as above.)
5. Of the men named in the items above, whom do you believe to be the best speaker?
6. Of the men named in the items above, whom do you prefer for the presidency?

One hundred fifty-two chairmen responded, providing their own envelopes and postage and so indicating that either they shared ST's tensions and were grateful for even a minor opportunity to release them or that they were habituated to responding to such requests after years of returning questionnaires to graduate students.

But here is a summary of the responses:

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Nixon	96	47			20	30
Rockefeller	41	100			2	10
Johnson			6	23	3	7
Kennedy			25	37	14	26
Stevenson			115	87	104	76
Symington			3	2	2	2

None of the columns adds up to 152 since many of the respondents did not choose to answer some of the queries. A number, for example, noted quite reasonably that they could scarcely choose between Nixon and Rockefeller as speakers since they had not heard Rockefeller speak.

In view of the rather overwhelming response for Stevenson, ST suspects that he uncovered the source of the demonstrations which caused such an interesting diversion, but not much else, at the Los Angeles convention. The

demonstrators were speech department chairmen!

The ST poll allowed the crossing of party lines and that probably accounts for the preference of Rockefeller over Nixon as Republican nominee, since by item six, Rockefeller's supporters had deserted. If the designations affixed to these politicians are accurate, and if the sample represents our department chairmen in general, we can conclude that our chairmen are "liberal" by a ratio of about two to one. Two respondents indicated that asking their preference for a party nominee was ambiguous. One pencilled, "Because he's a good man?" or "Because I think we can beat him?" ST, in his political innocence, admits he overlooked this ambiguity, but he is certain that straightforward, dependable department chairmen overwhelmingly took the first of the possible interpretations.

Although invited to add comments, explanations, arguments, and such to their check marks, not many did so. ST sympathizes with the man who turned his sheet over to type neatly on the reverse side: "Since Washington, D. C., has no voting privileges, I decline to specify answers to questions 2, 4, and 6." Here is a man of principle. ST was flattered by the several persons who wrote when asked who was "better" or "best," "it depends on what you mean." He confesses that he had not realized that his opinion of what makes one speaker "better" than another would be considered important in answering the question, naively assuming that each respondent would have rather strong beliefs about what makes a speaker "good" and would be guided by these beliefs and, perhaps, even list them briefly to indicate the basis of the response. One strong-minded person did indicate that Nixon is "best" because he is the "most effective."

Most interesting to ST were those who "crossed party lines" in questions five and six. Twenty-nine persons indicated a best speaker of a political party that differed from that of the person they prefer for the presidency. Twenty of these indicated Stevenson as the "best speaker" but prefer Nixon (in eighteen cases) or Rockefeller (in two) as president. To conclude his discussion of this poll, ST reports something that puzzles him: Six persons reported as believing Nixon to be the "best speaker" but would prefer Stevenson as president.

Conventions

CENTRAL STATES. Since ST was there he intended to report personally on the Central States Speech Association Convention (April 8-9, 1960,

SHOP TALK SPEECH CONVENTION CALENDAR

National

Speech Association of America: The Jefferson, St. Louis, December 28-30 (1961, New York; 1962, Cleveland; 1963 [August], Denver).

American Educational Theatre Association: University of Denver, August 28-30 (1961, Waldorf-Astoria, New York, August 28-30; 1962, University of Minnesota, August 24-26; 1963, University of Oregon, August 26-28; 1964, University of Pittsburgh, August 27-29).

American Speech and Hearing Association: Statler-Hilton, Los Angeles, November 1-5.

National Society for the Study of Communication: with SAA in St. Louis.

NUEA Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials: with SAA in St. Louis.

Regional

Western States: Oregon State College, Corvallis, November 24-26.

New England: Eastern Slopes Inn, North Conway, New Hampshire, November 25-26.

Southern States: Hotel Everglades, Miami, April 6-7 (High School and College Forensic Meet and Student Congress, April 3-7).

Central States: LaSalle Hotel, Chicago, April 14-15.

Chicago), but he wrote to the retiring executive secretary, Henry L. Ewbank, Jr., whose reply added to the statistics requested so many neatly phrased items that he became reporter (direct quotations are indicated) and ST errant commentator.

The argument that Chicago is a good city for conventions is supported by the registrations, 527, which compares well with the approximately 400 who attended in April, 1959, at Detroit but is two under the previous Chicago Convention in December, 1957. (This impulse toward comparison arises from the reading of early U. S. Census reports.) However, the 1957 attendance included "numerous itinerant department chairmen from outside the area, who either could not break the Christmas convention habit or were in search of bright young men for their staffs," so 1960 does represent a new high for attendance from within the CSSA area. Perhaps there were no others misled but "one man, in registering, was under the impression that this was a SAA meeting rather than CSSA. When he found that the most he could be charged was $5.00 (for a sustaining membership) he was shocked, believing that the $18-$20 range was what was expected." But let our reporter finish his story.

> This was the first time the LaSalle had set up a table to make it possible for a registrant to write without standing doubled over like a jackknife. Because this took up much of the elevator lobby on the mezzanine, togetherness was the order of the day. We can only trust that this created familiarity without contempt.

The programs included seventeen persons from outside the field of academic speech, mainly in business communication, speech correction, radio and theatre. Approximately 155 different people appeared in general or sectional meetings. Fewer than ten were on more than one section of the program. Participants on programs ranged from the revered A. Craig Baird to a multitude of people who were on that side of the table for the first time.

Forty-three served on the local arrangements committee. Jack Armold, chairman of that committee, was so successful in his operations that President-elect Charlotte Wells immediately invited him to avoid the frustrating thoughts of things that "should have been done another way" and take the job for 1961. It was generally agreed that there has never been such a successful Convention Reception as was engineered by Virginia Rutherford. The three or four who slipped away for an early dinner or to other callings were not missed, but they were the losers.

By scheduling the business meeting Friday afternoon, rather than Saturday, attendance was increased six-fold. At the same time, the addition of substantive resolutions made the meeting time too short. A complete report should add that President Donald K. Smith had the unique experience of presiding at a convention general session during which he was harrassed with requests to speak for and against resolutions and demands to amend. Finally he enriched staid parliamentary procedures by dealing with the resolutions by "a kind of choral reading"; those assembled were delighted and left agreeing that given more time the business meeting could be quite a pleasurable part of conventions.

New officers of the association are Charlotte Wells, University of Missouri, president; G. Bradford Barber, Illinois State Normal University, vice-president; Henry L. Ewbank, Jr., Purdue University, president-elect; and Merrill T. Baker, University of South Dakota, executive secretary. The 1961 convention will be held April 14-15 in Chicago at the LaSalle Hotel.

SOUTHERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION. Appropriately enough the Southern Speech Association held its Thirtieth Convention at the Hotel Robert E. Lee, Winston-Salem, North Carolina. SAA members the nation over will envy the southerners who, according to ST's special correspondent, "enjoyed the fine service and the very reasonable rates of the hotel." The rest of the correspondent's report of the activities on April 4-8 follows.

> For the first three days the Association held its annual tournament for high school and college students. Under the direction of Frank Shirley of Wake Forest College, more than 400 students from sixty schools participated in the events.
>
> About 200 teachers arrived on Thursday for the convention meetings, during which many of the students took part in the Congress of Human Relations. True to the traditions of southern hospitality, Wake Forest College entertained convention-goers

at a buffet supper on the campus, followed by a tour of the college's gardens and a performance of *Oedipus Rex*.

The convention general sessions were high-lighted by the annual President's Address by MacDonald Held and by a speech on programming by Elmo Ellis, of WSB, Atlanta.

Seventeen sectional meetings brought about the ordinary convention frustration of deciding what-to-go-hear-now. Although the general topics would sound in print much like those from an average speech convention, more than one Southerner would support the writer in asserting that the quality was high. One very special meeting was composed of a group of papers in honor of Giles Wilkeson Gray; it was culminated by H. P. Constans' "Giles Gray, Man of Many Parts." An especially lively meeting was held on "How to Get a Book Published"; publishers' representatives were cross-examined by prospective authors who crowded into the meeting room.

AFA and AETA held meetings in conjunction with the Association. AETAers were especially amused by Herman Middleton's vivid narration of the experiences of carrying a complete production of *The Women* through the Orient with a total of 750 pounds of scenery, costumes, and luggage for twelve girls.

At the final business session the assembled group responded warmly to the announcement that the Southern Speech Association has been recognized as a constituent member of the Southern Humanities Conference. President MacDonald Held turned the gavel over to President-elect Joseph Wetherby for the convention next year in Miami (Hotel Everglades, April 3-7). Then the Texans present gave Mr. and Mrs. Held a silver pitcher as an expression of affection and praise.

DON STREETER
University of Houston

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY. On May 13 the Golden Anniversary of Delta Sigma Rho, Ohio State University chapter, was celebrated. Alumni of DSR from Ohio State, Ohio Wesleyan, Oberlin, John Carroll, Western Reserve, and Wooster attended. A former Ohio State debate coach, C. Emory Glander, served as chairman for the banquet. Herold T. Ross, chairman of the department at DePauw and national president of DSR, gave the principal address, "The Fifty Years of a Forensic Honorary Fraternity." W. Hayes Yeager presented a Distinguished Alumnus award to John W. Bricker, former governor, U. S. Senator, vice presidential nominee, and trustee of Ohio State University.

A record-breaking number of initiates in quality and quantity were inducted into the fraternity: Michael V. DiSalle, Governor of Ohio; Novice G. Fawcell, President of OSU; O. J. Wilson, President of Findlay College; Keith Brooks and George Lewis, both on the OSU speech faculty. Carl V. Weygandt, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Ohio and Chairman of the Board of Trustees of The College of Wooster, was inducted into the Wooster chapter; and the new Ohio Wesleyan University President, David A. Lockmiller, became a member of OWU chapter.

At the celebration banquet, the annual OSU debate awards were made. The Alpine Angus MacArthur award for the best four-year debater was presented to William Hamann. The Johnston-Wiley trophy for the outstanding debater of the year was given to Allen Rule for the second year.

THETA ALPHA PHI. The national convention of Theta Alpha Phi was held at Purdue University, in the Loeb Playhouse, in March. It was attended by delegates, and in some cases full chapters, from as far away as New Jersey, Texas, and Wyoming. The host chapter, whose advisor was also national president, Samuel M. Marks, welcomed the delegates to two days of plays and discussion. They also saw Purdue Playshop's productions of *Annie Get Your Gun* and *Agamemnon*. Franklin City College presented *The Fall of the House of Usher;* the Wilson Branch, Chicago City College, *An Interlude;* and Ohio Wesleyan, *The Lesson*. Hubert C. Heffner of Indiana University was the guest speaker and conducted a discussion of the production of *Agamemnon*.

The new national officers are Lawrence E. Tucker, Illinois Wesleyan, president; Charles E. Parker, University of Wyoming, vice-president; and Robert Masters, Indiana State Teachers College, secretary-treasurer. Since the convention, Mr. Masters has resigned because of ill health and S. M. Marks was elected by the National Council to fill the unexpired term.

LOUISIANA SPEECH CONVENTION. The annual Louisiana Speech Association Professional Conference and Speech Festival will be held on the campus of the University of Southwestern Louisiana, December 8-10. In addition to helping USL celebrate a new name (changed from Southwestern Louisiana Institute), approximately eight hundred high school and college students and faculty members will participate in speech contests and professional meetings. E. J. J. Kramer is in charge of arranging the meeting.

CORRECTION. Ex-executive secretary Owen Peterson informs us that two figures on convention attendance reports given in February 1960 Shop Talk (p. 116) are incorrect. Attendance in Chicago, 1958 was 1,775 (not 1690), and at Washington in 1959, 1,644 (not 1604).

NOTE TO CONTRIBUTORS. Although ST enjoys the many newsletters, releases, bulletins, programs, brochures, and such that he receives from many faithful correspondents, he is sometimes puzzled by the task of digging out items for Shop Talk from among many of local interest only. Keep sending the fliers, clippings, departmental announcements, etc., but enclose also a note indicating ST items particularly.

Although it is not necessary to put each item on a separate sheet, the indication of a recent appointee sandwiched in the story of a summer institute may be lost in the clipping and sorting process. Leave plenty of space between items and be liberal in repeating the name of your school with each item so a stray clipping may be easily identified.

Were activities in your department unreported? Don't be disappointed just before Christmas! Send news and notes for the December issue to Shop Talk before October 19, for February by December 12.

Robert L. Scott
Department of Speech
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis 14, Minnesota

APPOINTMENTS

Abilene Christian College: Paul Forshay, director of forensics; Frank Morris, director of technical theatre.

Albion College: D. Richard Smith, assistant professor.

American University: R. Talbert Russell, Donald M. Williams, professors.

Colorado State University: Richard S. Jackson, technical director in theatre.

Central Missouri State College: Paul E. Ried, assistant professor; Abe Basset, instructor.

Cornell Univerity: Thomas M. Scheidel, assistant professor; Rex N. Dixon, instructor.

David Lipscomb College: Jerry Henderson.

Delta State College: Thomas Tedford, head of the department.

Denison University: William Dresser, assistant professor.

East Carolina College: Ralph H. Rives.

Georgetown University: Virginia Covington.

Georgia State College: Esther Kling.

Greenville College: Ivan E. Ratcliffe.

Hofstra College: Howard Seigman.

Idaho State College: Gaylan Collier, Gwenyth Vaughn, associate professors; Robert Donnelly, instructor.

Kendall College: Laura Kent.

Kent State University: Philip A. Macomber, assistant professor; Donald J. Baker, instructor; Barton R. Derby, television engineer.

Linfield College: Craig Singletary, instructor.

Long Beach State College: Alfred Larr, Kenneth Shanks, assistant professors; Herbert Camburn, instructor.

Long Island University: Malcolm Lieblich, assistant professor; Barbara Pasternack, instructor.

Los Angeles State College: Walter Fisher, Marcella Oberle, assistant professors.

Louisiana College: Charles Parker.

Marquette University: John Mendiola, assistant professor.

Michigan State University: Herbert J. Oyer, director of the speech and hearing clinic.

Northwestern University: Samuel C. Ball, Kenneth L. Brown, Inge Schmidt, instructors.

Ohio University: Brooks Sanders, assistant professor; Elizabeth Goulding, Ronald Werner, instructors.

Orange County State College: James D. Young, associate professor; Lee Granell, instructor.

Parsons College: R. Wayne Pace, assistant professor.

Purdue University: Albert L. Furbay, assistant professor; Scott A. Dye, Peter E. Kane, Gordon R. Owen, Jimmie D. Trent, instructors.

St. Louis University: Patricia Barnett, John I. C. Foreman, Beryl Stanley, instructors.

San Diego State College: Eugene Ouellette.

San Fernando Valley State College: Bertram Barer, assistant professor.

South Dakota State College: Wayne Hoogestraat, assistant professor; Robert Litke, instructor.

Southeastern Louisiana College: Jerry Tarver.

Southwest Texas State College: Harold Tedford.

State University of New York Teachers College, Oneonta: Evelyn D. Duncan, Muriel A. Kellerhouse, George A. Test.

Susquehanna University: Bruce L. Nary, assistant professor.

Syracuse University: W. Scott Curtis, assistant professor.

Temple University: Herbert W. Simons, assistant professor.

Texas Christian University: William B. Hawes.

Tufts College: Kalmin A. Burnim.

University of Akron: William Mavis.

University of Arizona: Jack B. Howe, associate professor; Gene England, assistant professor; Henry B. Schmitz, instructor.

University of California, Santa Barbara: Gary N. Hess, assistant professor; Robert L. Sleath, acting instructor.

University of Colorado: Virginia Puich, instructor.

University of Connecticut: Phyllis Lewis, instructor; John Vlandis, director of forensics.

University of Delaware: Alan Billings, Turner Edge, instructors.

University of Florida: Ralph R. Levtenegger, August W. Staub, assistant professors; Ronald Jerrit, technical director of the theatre.

University of Georgia: Anthony Collins, Gerald Kahan, Richard Weinman.

University of Kansas: Frank E. X. Dance, assistant professor.

University of Kentucky: J. W. Patterson, assistant professor.

University of Michigan: Martin C. Schultz, Alfred W. Storey, assistant professors; Andrew E. Doe, instructor.

University of Minnesota: Jay Jensen, assistant professor.

University of Minnesota, Duluth: Charles Boughton, technical director of the theatre.

University of Missouri: Donald G. Williamson, assistant professor.

University of Nebraska: Neil McArthur, instructor.

University of Nevada: Terry Ellmore, instructor.

University of North Dakota: Donald W. McCaffrey, assistant professor; Robert R. Kunkel, instructor.

University of Oklahoma: Wayne E. Brockriede, associate professor.

University of Pittsburgh: Ralph G. Allen, assistant professor.

University of Richmond: Harry L. Mahnken, assistant professor.

University of Southern California: Ollie Backus and Robert Olson.

University of Washington: Robert M. Post, instructor.

University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee: Goodwin F. Berquist, Jr., assistant professor.

Valparaiso University: Malcolm McBride and Berle Russell.

Wabash College: Joseph O'Rourke, instructor.

Wayne State University: Wallace M. Bradley and Donald P. Garner, instructors.

Westminster College: Thomas L. Fernandez, assistant professor.

Wisconsin State College and Institute of Technology: Ted N. Smith, assistant professor.

Wisconsin State College, Superior: Kathryn Conneely, assistant professor.

Promotions

American University: J. H. Yocum, professor.

Arizona State University: James Yeater, assistant professor.

Baylor University: Thomas B. Abbott and Chloe Armstrong, professors.

Bradley University: L. E. Norton, chairman.

Central Michigan University: Keith Maxwell, associate professor.

Cornell University: Carroll C. Arnold, professor.

DePauw University: John R. Foxen and Darrell H. Gooch, associate professors.

Kendall College: Arlin Hiken, dean.

Long Beach State College: John H. Green and Joseph Wagner, professors; David Krueger, assistant professor.

Los Angeles State College: R. L. Douglass, professor.

Mankato State College: Marceline Erickson, professor.

Marquette University: William D. Trotter, associate professor.

Morningside College: Fred W. Lee, chairman.

Northwestern University: Paul Moore, professor; Laura L. Lee, assistant professor.

Oberlin College: Charley A. Leistner, associate professor.

Ohio State University: Roy H. Bowen, director of theatre.

Purdue University: Leland S. Winck, assistant head of the department; Mason A. Hicks, professor; Bob G. Ackley, instructor.

State University of Iowa: John Kuiper and David Thayer, assistant professors.

Teachers College, Columbia University: William H. Canfield, assistant professor.

University of Colorado: Mary Margaret Robb, professor; R. Victor Harnack, associate professor.

University of Connecticut: Nafe Katter, assistant professor.

University of Florida: Douglas Ehninger, professor; L. L. Zimmerman, associate professor.

University of Illinois: Halbert E. Gulley, Raymond E. Nadeau, professors; Clara Behringer, associate professor; Frances Johnson, Webster Smalley, assistant professors.

University of Minnesota: Robert D. Moulton, Clark D. Starr, Robert L. Scott, associate professors.

University of Minnesota, Duluth: Pacy Friedman, assistant professor.

University of Nebraska: Donald Olson, associate professor.

University of Oklahoma: Jack E. Douglas, professor; Roger E. Nebergall, associate professor.

University of Oregon: Glenn Starlin, professor; John R. Shepherd, associate professor.

University of Southern California: William H. Perkins, professor.

University of Washington: Barnet Baskerville, professor.

Wabash College: Victor M. Powell, chairman.

Washington State University: Calvin A. Watson, assistant professor.

Wayne State University: Richard D. Spear, assistant professor.

On Leave

Abilene Christian College: Edward Brown continues his leave another year to study at the University of Oklahoma.

Brooklyn College: John K. Duffy will be Fulbright Lecturer in Audiology at the University of Bombay this year.

Doane College: Virginia Hastings Floyd has received a leave to attend Northwestern University on a Danforth Foundation Teacher Study Grant.

Eastern Illinois University: J. Glenn Ross will be on sabbatical for the fall semester.

Hofstra College: Bernard Beckerman will be in Israel this year on a Fulbright lectureship in theatre. In his absence, James VanWart will act as chairman of the department. Frank Iezzi is studying educational and commercial television facilities under a grant from the Ford Foundation.

Los Angeles State College: Mary Huber will spend a sabbatical year traveling and studying in the United States and Europe. Robert D. Kully is on leave with the European Division of the University of Maryland Overseas Program.

Louisiana State University: Owen M. Peterson will be on a sabbatical for the fall semester doing research at the British Museum in London. Claude Shaver has been granted a visiting professorship of English as a foreign language in Hong Kong under the Smith-Mundt Act. He will supervise the teaching of English in several refugee colleges within the area.

Northwestern University: Donley F. Feddersen will be on leave to serve as director of programming for the National Educational Television and Radio Center in New York. Martin J. Maloney will be visiting associate professor at Stanford University.

Pennsylvania State University: Robert T. Oliver will be visiting professor of speech at Los Angeles State College during the fall semester.

Southwest Texas State College: Willard Booth has been awarded a Danforth Grant to study at the University of Southern California.

State University of Iowa: William Reardon will teach at Louisiana State University this year.

University of Arizona: Diane Kern is on leave to teach at Wisconsin State College, River Falls.

University of California, Santa Barbara: Upton S. Palmer and John C. Snidecor will be on sabbatical leaves fall semester. Edwin R. Schoell will act as chairman in Mr. Palmer's absence. Forbes I. Hill will be on leave spring semester.

University of Florida: John W. Kirk will be on leave. Ronald Jerrit will serve as technical director of the theatre in his absence.

University of Houston: Auley Luke will continue his leave to study at the University of Oklahoma. Gerard Wagner is on leave studying at Indiana University.

University of Illinois: Raymond E. Nadeau is on sabbatical leave first semester to do translations of *De Statibus* and "On Delivery" by Hermogenes. Severina Nelson is on sabbatical leave to conduct a research study on adult aphasics at Coler Hospital, New York City.

University of Minnesota: Kenneth Graham will be on leave for the fall quarter on a Ford Foundation Grant to study theatre productions in New York City.

University of Minnesota, Duluth: Fred Meitzer will be studying at Ohio State University this year.

University of Missouri: Loren Reid will spend the year abroad teaching in the University of Maryland Overseas Program. He will also continue his research in eighteenth-century British public address.

University of Utah: Boyer Jarvis has been awarded a fellowship by the Fund for Adult Education to study the use of television as an instrument of adult education for civic responsibility at the Civic Education Center, Washington University.

University of Washington: During the fall quarter, Albert L. Franzke will be in Germany studying internal communications in labor unions.

Wisconsin State College, River Falls: Blake Anderson is on leave studying at Purdue University.

Back From Leave

Arkansas Polytechnic College: Charles Reed.

Baylor University: Chloe Armstrong after a year teaching at Wayne State University.

Northwestern University: Walter B. Scott, Jr., from a year teaching in France on a Fulbright; Jack C. Ellis after serving as a visiting faculty member at U.C.L.A.

St. Olaf College: Theodore F. Nelson to his duties as department chairman after a sabbatical year of travel and study in Europe and Mexico.

State University of Iowa: James Clancy to the University Theatre after travel and study throughout Europe on a Ford Foundation Grant.

University of California, Santa Barbara: Theodore W. Hatlen after a sabbatical.

Wabash College: Charles E. Scott after a three year leave to study at Yale.

Washington State University: E. J. Lennon after studying speech therapy methods in Europe.

Wayne State University: Eugene H. Bahn after a year's leave to serve as substitute Dean of Anatolia College, Thessaloniki, Greece.

Retirements

Bryng Bryngelson, one of the pioneer teachers and scholars in the field of speech pathology, reached the age of compulsory retirement at the University of Minnesota this spring. He was honored at two dinners: the first sponsored by the Minnesota Speech and Hearing Association, and the second, at which Charles Van Riper was the featured speaker, by the Department of Speech and Theater Arts. Donald K. Smith, chairman at Minnesota, writes, "Bryng's retirement illustrates the semantic problem in the word 'age.' He is obviously more vigorous than most of us two-thirds his age. But rules are rules, and despite our reluctance, Bryng has retired in an official way. Of course, in an unofficial way, we look forward to many years of continuing discussion with him of the affairs of the department he did so much to develop." Mr. Bryngelson will still occupy his office in Folwell Hall to continue work on several writing projects.

Beryl Meek, State University of New York Teachers College, Oneonta, retired in June.

With the close of the second semester of 1959-60, Giles W. Gray retired from active teaching. He had served at Louisiana State University for twenty-eight years. On March 18, a dinner was held in his honor at the L.S.U. Faculty Club; 125 of his friends attended. Gordon Peterson, University of Michigan, gave the main address. As a part of the program a symposium on "Trends in Speech Education" was held. Donald Streeter, University of Houston, Lucia Morgan, University of North Carolina, and Edna West, Northwestern Louisiana State College, participated in the symposium.

Jane Dorsey Zimmerman retired in June after teaching for thirty years in the department of speech at Teachers College, Columbia University.

Summer Theatre

Adelphi College: *Romanoff and Juliet, Born Yesterday, Cat on a Hot Tin Roof, The Gazebo, Make a Million, The Time of the Cuckoo.*

Central Missouri State College (at its Shepherd of the Hills Theatre in Branson): *Janus; Come Back, Little Sheba; My Three Angels; King of Hearts;* a dramatic adaptation of the novel *Shepherd of the Hills.*

Kendall College: *Right You Are (If You Think You Are).*

Long Beach State College: *The Barretts of Wimpole Street* with Julie Haydon as guest star.

Marquette University: *Peter Pan.*

Mississippi Southern College: *The Reluctant Debutante, The Mousetrap, The Dark at the Top of the Stairs, Gigi, Harvey, The Glass Menagerie,* and *Sabrina Fair.*

Northwestern University: *Him, The Death of a Salesman, The Matchmaker,* and a children's play in "grand repertory."

Oberlin College: The College's Gilbert and Sullivan Players produced their eighth consecutive summer theatre repertory season on Cape Cod. At Falmouth, they presented *Patience, La Perichole, Utopia Limited, HMS Pinafore, Trial by Jury, The Merry Widow, The Yeomen of the Guard,* and *Die Fledermaus.*

Ohio State University: *The Man Who Came to Dinner, Leave It to Jane, The Matchmaker, On Borrowed Time, Of Mice and Men,* and *The Pajama Game.*

Purdue University: *The Tunnel of Love, Private Lives,* and *The Moon is Blue.*

St. Louis University: *Ladies in Retirement* with a cast of nuns attending the summer school.

South Dakota State College: *Yes and No.*

State University of Iowa: *The Bedbug, Amphytryon 38, Carmen,* and *The Burnt Flower Bed* as part of the Twenty-second Annual Fine Arts Festival.

Stetson University: *My Sister Eileen; Bell, Book and Candle; Visit to a Small Planet; Annie Get Your Gun.*

Teachers College, Columbia University: *Once in a Lifetime.*

Texas Christian University: *Gigi* and *The Diary of Anne Frank.*

University of Colorado: *Look Back in Anger* and *Brigadoon* as part of the Summer Creative Arts Program; the Third Annual Shakespeare Festival included *Henry IV, Twelfth Night,* and *Antony and Cleopatra.*

University of Connecticut: *Say, Darling; Blithe Spirit; The Little Foxes; Oh, Men! Oh, Women!; Witness for the Prosecution; My Three Angels.*

University of Houston: *Playboy of the Western World* and *Much Ado About Nothing.*

University of Illinois: The Robinson Jeffers version of Euripides' *Medea, The Waltz of the Toreadors,* and *The Land of the Dragon* (children's theatre).

University of Michigan: *Annie Get Your Gun, Amphitryon 38, As You Like It, Picnic,* and *Don Giovanni.*

University of Minnesota: *Romeo and Juliet, Candida, Waiting for Godot,* and on the Centennial Showboat at various stops up and down the Mississippi River, *Forty-Five Minutes from Broadway.*

University of Missouri: The Starlight Theatre, with no performances interrupted by rain, presented *The Loud Red Patrick* and *Out of the Frying Pan.*

University of Oregon: *The Matchmaker, Candida,* and *Rashomon.*

University of Pittsburgh: *The Telephone* and *All My Sons.*

Theatre Notes

The department of speech and theatre at Brooklyn College announces that Stuart Vaughn, artistic director of the Phoenix Theater of New York City, is teaching a course entitled "Styles of Directing" this fall semester.

The Iowa Community Theater Association held its annual meeting in Cedar Rapids, September 17 and 18. Two new organizations, at Garner and Villisca, bring the ICTA's membership to twenty groups. John R. Winnie of the State University of Iowa is the executive secretary.

Harvey Powers of Bucknell University has been awarded the Alec Drummond Fellowship at Cornell University for 1960-61.

This spring the Clarion State Teachers College (Pennsylvania) Community Players group was organized. Two plays will be given by the college and two will be given jointly by the college and the community.

Alan Schneider, currently director of the New York Shakespeare Festival's *Measure for Measure,* will be a visiting director and consultant to the Hofstra College Playhouse in the spring.

The Linfield College Vesper Players will tour the Western states this fall and spring to

produce religious dramas in churches of many denominations. This is the twenty-seventh year of Linfield tours.

ST has received a copy of Number 1, Volume I, of *The OSU Theatre Collection Newsletter*. The staff of the Ohio State University collection has inaugurated the newsletter to keep interested persons informed of materials available, research in progress, and acquisitions to the collection. Recently the collection received more than four hundred theatre and circus posters from the Library of Congress, the Division of Prints and Photographs. Most of these items are from the late 1800's and are not available elsewhere.

The Theatre of St. Cloud State College, Minnesota, which has been selected for an overseas tour this fall by the American Educational Theatre Association and the USO, will take a cast of eighteen in the musical comedy, *Wonderful Town*, to the Northeast Command beginning October 17. The five weeks itinerary includes Iceland, Greenland, Newfoundland, and Baffin Island.

James Barton, Southwest Texas State College, again directed *A Cloud of Witnesses*, the story of the Alamo, at the Texas State Historical Theater at San Jose Mission in San Antonio. Students and graduates of eleven colleges and universities of Texas and Oklahoma made up the sixty-member cast.

The University of Southwestern Louisiana installed air conditioning in its theatre this summer to make possible the first summer production at Lafayette. *The Solid Gold Cadillac* drew a five-night audience of 2400, as many as attended all productions during the preceding academic year.

Summer Workshops and Institutes

The Adelphi College Summer Workshop in Speech and Hearing Rehabilitation featured field trips to various hospitals and clinics and classroom work and lectures by seven special visitors: Elmer E. Baker, School of Education, New York University; Louis Dickar, Chief of the Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation at Kings County Hospital Medical Center; Michael Marge, department of speech, Montclair State Teachers College; Helen Donavan, Bureau for Speech Improvement, Board of Education, City of New York; Louise Gurren, Director, Bureau of Speech Improvement in New York City Public Schools; Bernard Locke, Chief, Psychology Service, Veterans' Administration Hospital, New York City; and Louis Kleinfeld, Head of the Voice and Speech Clinic at Mt. Sinai Hospital, New York City.

Two workshops were held at Arkansas State Teachers College, Conway, this summer. The Theatre Workshop under the direction of Sue Lineback presented *The Heiress*. Fifth and sixth graders from the college's Demonstration School were used in the Creative Dramatics Workshop under the direction of Leona Scott.

Thomas A. Rousse, University of Texas, and Elton Abernathy, Southwest Texas State College, were lecturers at the annual Baylor University Summer Speech Workshop, June 13-July 1. Fifty-four high school students studied under the direction of Glenn R. Capp.

Twenty-five Peoria area high school debaters attended the third annual High School Debate Workshop sponsored by the Bradley University speech department in June. Classes and activities were under the direction of Charles Tucker.

Central Michigan University used the Ramsdell Opera House, Manistee, Michigan, again this summer to hold special classes for both graduate and undergraduate students. Madge Skelly served as manager-director of the group, which produced ten plays.

The Twenty-fifth Annual High School Institute in Speech ("the third oldest of such summer programs in the country") was held on the Kent State University campus June 23-July 15. The program consisted of courses in public address and forensics, broadcasting, dramatic arts, and interpretation. Twenty-five high school students between the freshman and junior years were selected upon the recommendation of their speech teachers and principals. Kent State also sponsored the Sixteenth Annual Children's Summer Clinic. Forty-five children and fifty parents attended a five-week session in the new Speech and Hearing Clinic's quarters under the direction of Edward Hutchinson.

Two sessions of the annual High School Leadership Conference in Speech at Louisiana State University were held under the direction of Clinton W. Bradford. One hundred twenty high school students participated.

The summer session at Marquette University featured five workshops conducted by the school of speech: parliamentary procedure, conducted by Hugo E. Hellman; debate coaching, under Joseph B. Laine's direction; the class play, by Leo Jones; speech correction and the classroom teacher, with Alfred J. Sokolnicki in charge;

and teaching via television, under Raymond Bedwell.

Fifty speech therapists attended the ninth International Northern Great Plains Conference on Special Education and Rehabilitation on the campus of Minot State Teachers College, North Dakota, August 15-18. This conference, organized to discuss special education and rehabilitation problems peculiar to an area with scattered rural population, includes the three provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba, and the four states of Montana, Wyoming, South Dakota, and North Dakota, and brings together representatives from the fields of medicine, special education, speech therapy, physical therapy, occupational therapy, rehabilitation counseling, psychology, social work, and administration. Featured speakers were Earl S. Miers, trustee of the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, and Leonard W. Larson, president-elect of the American Medical Association. William S. Howell, University of Minnesota, conducted a workshop in public information and persuasion. Edna Gilbert, Minot State Teachers, president of the conference, was in charge of the program.

Northwestern University conducted the Airborne Television Instruction Workshop, July 11-15, to prepare teachers for participation in the Midwest Program of Airborne Television Instruction. Charles Hunter, chairman of the department of radio, television, and film coordinated the workshop. June 12-15 a workshop on "Hearing and Its Problems" was sponsored by the University and by the Hearing Aid Industry Conference. It was attended by sixty-five hearing aid dealers from all parts of the country. The following served as leaders in audiology: Raymond Carhart, Leo Doerfler, James Jerger, William Hardy, Earl Harford, Ira Hirsh, Kenneth Johnson, Hayes Newby, and Helmer Myklebust. George Shambaugh, an etiologist, and Harry L. Wells, vice-president and business manager emeritus of Northwestern, also appeared on the program.

The Ohio State University Summer Center of Communicative Arts held a five week program designed to provide an opportunity for interested high school juniors and seniors "to explore the arts of communication." Students could choose among programs in speech and hearing sciences, basic communication, debate and discussion, and theatre. The workshop sought to give the students supervised training in these areas to enable them to gauge the depth of their interests before entering college. Robert Kibler was director.

Sixty-five students from five states attended the Tenth Annual High School Forensic Workshop at Ohio University from June 12-25. Professor Paul D. Brandes directed the sessions, assisted by Richard Bald and Theodore Walwik of the government department and Gary Hawkins, Kenneth Frandsen, Joseph Miller, and Robert Williams of the speech department. A three day round-robin tournament concluded the debate work. Students in interpretation, oratory, and extemporaneous speaking performed at the banquet which concluded the workshop.

During the summer session at Purdue University, forty-eight outstanding high school students attended a Pre-College Institute in Speech and Hearing Therapy under the direction of Psi Iota Xi National Philanthropic Sorority. Two workshops in drama were also held at Purdue, one for high school teachers and the other for high school students. The workshops were climaxed with the production of three one-act plays.

At St. Louis University, a one-week institute in experimental theatre forms under the direction of Robert O. Butler received attention when it was featured in the Sunday magazine section of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*.

Under the direction of Elton Abernathy, Southwest Texas State College held its Eighth Annual Speech Workshop for high school students. Guest lecturers included Glenn Capp, Baylor University; Gaylan Collier, Abilene Christian College; Angus Springer, Southwestern University; and Jerry Powell, Director of the Texas Interscholastic League. Fifty students participated.

The State University of Iowa sponsored three inter-related workshops. Thirty-three high school students from five states working in the Twenty-ninth Annual Workshop in Dramatic Art presented five plays under the direction of Iowa high school teachers supervised by Philip Benson. Thirty-five students from three states participated in the Twenty-ninth Annual Workshop in Discussion and Debate under the direction of Robert L. Gregg. Both of these workshops served as laboratories for fourteen teachers enrolled in the Eighth Annual Workshop in Teaching Speech which was conducted by Hugh F. Seabury.

Syracuse University's 1960 Summer Course in Drama under the direction of Sawyer Falk was

held in August at Stratford-on-Avon, England. In addition to attending the Shakespeare Festival and undertaking special projects under Mr. Falk's direction, the group had ample opportunity for touring.

The speech department of the Texas College of Arts and Industries offered its annual drama workshop for high school teachers of the south Texas area. The teachers directed students from the Kingsville Junior and Senior High Schools in scenes from plays.

A three week workshop in speech correction for the classroom teacher was conducted at the University of Arizona under the direction of Kenneth Dimmick. Helmer Myklebust and John T. Hayden were special consultants for the workshop.

The Bureau of Speech Services, University of Colorado, sponsored the Thirteenth Annual Speech Institute for High School Students, June 27-July 22. A total of fifty-eight students from twenty states participated in drama and forensics.

McKenzie Buck directed a special workshop for children with communicative disorders and their parents. The workshop was sponsored by the University of Florida and the North Central Florida Society for Crippled Children.

Under the auspices of Lono, the ancient Hawaiian god of communications, the International Conference on General Semantics was held at the University of Hawaii this summer. Conference leaders included Lloyd Morain, Stanley Diamond, Earl Kelley, Weller Embler, S. I. Hayakawa, Anatol Rapoport, and Elwood Murray. Shunzo Sakamaki, dean of the summer session, was general chairman of the conference.

The annual Speech Round-up at the University of Houston attracted seventy-three students from three states. The workshop was organized into two main groups, forensics-public speaking and interpretation-duet acting.

The Twentieth Annual Summer Speech Conference at the University of Michigan on July 7 featured speeches by Edgar E. Willis, University of Michigan; Jack Matthews, University of Pittsburgh; Keith Brooks, Ohio State University; Hayden K. Carruth, University of Michigan; Samuel Selden, University of California at Los Angeles; George V. Bohman, Wayne State University; Peter N. Ladefoged, University of Edinburgh; Andrew E. Doe, State University of Iowa; and a luncheon address by Kenneth G. Hance, Michigan State University.

Seventy children attended the Eighth Annual Summer Speech and Hearing Clinic at the University of Minnesota, Duluth.

A workshop course in the production of special educational television programs was conducted June 13-25 at the University of Oregon. Registrants from four states worked under the direction of E. A. Kretsinger, assisted by Howard Ramey and Kaslon Zoller.

A special summer course in speech and communication theory was conducted at Wayne State University by R. S. Ross and G. V. Bohman. Guest lecturers included Franklin Knower, Ohio State University, Chloe Armstrong, Baylor University, and many members of the Wayne State staff.

Summer Visitors and Staff

Ollie Backus, formerly of the University of Alabama and now of the University of Southern California, was at Los Angeles State College.

Janet Bolton, University of Southern California, was at Northwestern University.

Donald C. Bryant, State University of Iowa, lectured on "Rhetoric as a Liberal Study" at the University of Wisconsin in July.

James F. Dunlap, University of Akron, was at the University of Puerto Rico.

Wilbur E. Gilman, Queens College, lectured at the University of Missouri ("The Function of Public Address in the New Education") and at the University of Oregon ("The Role of Logic in Speechmaking" and "John Milton's Practice of Rhetoric") in June.

Svend Smith, Director of the Research Laboratories for the School of Speech Disorders, Copenhagen, Denmark, was visiting lecturer at the Purdue speech and hearing clinic in July.

Charlotte G. Wells, University of Missouri, taught at the University of Oregon's summer session in Portland. She also lectured at the University of Oregon, Eugene, and at Central Missouri State College.

At Louisiana State University, Douglas Ehninger, University of Florida, delivered a series of eight lectures at the Twenty-sixth Annual Conference on Speech Education, June 14-23. Hubert Heffner, Indiana University, and Barnard Hewitt, University of Illinois, lectured as part of the annual Fine Arts Festival.

Visiting faculty at St. Louis University included Carmelita Schmelig, Fontbonne College, St. Louis, and Emile G. McAnany, S.J., and F. Joseph Schulte of the St. Louis University High

School, who conducted a five-week course in speech and theatre for high school students. Edmund Lyndeck of the St. Louis Municipal Opera and Kenneth C. Lyman, University of Wisconsin, delivered lectures.

The University of Colorado had four visiting faculty members this summer: John V. Irwin, University of Wisconsin; Marian Milstead, Cheyenne, Wyoming High School; Ernest Peck, Speech Co-ordinator of the Denver Public Schools; and Rex Robinson, Utah State University. Francis Hodge, University of Texas, and Gerald Kahan, University of Georgia, directed plays in the annual Shakespeare Festival. Caley Summers, University of Texas, costumed the repertory company of collegiate players from the United States and Canada.

Lecturers at the University of Oregon, in addition to Wilbur Gilman and Charlotte Wells, were Tyrone Guthrie, who presented a two-week series and appeared informally before many classes, Robert Kostka, Art Director of WTTW-TV, Chicago, and John L. Casteel, Director of Field Work and Professor of Practical Theology, Union Theological Seminary.

Visitors at Teachers College, Columbia University, were Richard Norman and Elizabeth Caughran, Barnard College; Harold Scholl, Montclair State College, New Jersey; Aurand Harris, New York City Public Schools, and Joseph Peluso, New Rochelle, New York, Public Schools.

NEW NAMES, DIVISIONS, AND DEPARTMENTS. Our friends at what used to be Southwestern Louisiana Institute inform us with pride that we may now address mail to them at the University of Southwestern Louisiana. Although this is the only new university reported to ST, the creation of new divisions and departments indicates further effort to meet the threat of the undergraduate population explosion.

A Department of Speech and Drama was created at the University of Colorado on July 1. Thorrel B. Fest is acting chairman and "is leading the fifteen members in the department through the problems of organization."

A new department of Speech and Dramatic Arts has been established at Clarion State Teachers College, Pennsylvania. Elbert Moses, Jr., chairman of the new department, will continue to serve as director of the speech and hearing clinic.

Seth A. Fessenden has assumed, in addition to his duties as head of the speech department, the chairmanship of the division of communication at Orange County State College. This new division will encompass the work in speech, speech correction and audiology, theatre, radio, television, English composition, and journalism.

The department at American University has been expanded to include broadcasting and has been retitled the Department of Speech Arts.

At the State University of New York Teachers College, Fredonia, a merger has created a Department of English and Speech. Robert Nossen, professor of English and chairman of the department, writes, "The combined department does not mean the loss of identity for speech, but simply an administrative arrangement."

The Department of Speech at the University of Illinois is now the Department of Speech and Theatre.

BUILDINGS

Fall is moving time for departments on many campuses. At Abilene Christian College the speech department will move into the new Citizenship Center which will have, among other facilities, three television studios.

A new little theatre, a scenery shop and rehearsal halls have been constructed in the Lyceum Building on the Arizona State University campus. A flexible stage and auditorium will permit many styles of productions.

New facilities for dramatic productions are also available this year at Furman University. A new auditorium, a new stage "of generous proportions," new stage equipment, storage space, scene shop, costume rooms, and dressing rooms will make possible an expanded theatre program.

In June the School of Speech at Kent State University occupied new quarters in the three and a half million dollar, air-conditioned Speech and Music Center. Included in the new building are a five hundred seat theatre with equipment, a speech and hearing wing of forty-eight rooms, four radio and two television studios, with control rooms, a film editing room, a forensics library, and flexible classrooms.

Morningside College has just completed a successful campaign to raise money to build a new $1,250,000 arts building. A 1500 capacity auditorium and a little theatre seating 300 will be part of the installation.

The theatre at the University of Missouri will move into its facilities in the recently completed Fine Arts Centre. The theatre seats 300 and has a "spacious scene shop" at the rear of the stage.

The University of Pittsburgh has added a new audiology laboratory of two acoustically treated rooms. The increased space will make possible an expanded clinical program, laboratory work for students, and research.

Wisconsin State College, Superior, announces the completion of a new little theatre which will make possible the addition of children's productions.

Curricula

The department at American University announces two additions to its program. Beginning this fall, a Master of Arts in Speech Arts will be offered. A special program for superior students in drama has been inaugurated in cooperation with Arena Stage of Washington, D. C. Selected second-semester juniors, first-semester seniors, and graduate students will spend a semester in residence at Arena Stage and, in addition to participating in the production of plays, will submit a research paper. This program is under the supervision of Zelda Fichander and J. H. Yocum.

Central Michigan University this fall began a program for a Master of Arts in Speech in the areas of speech arts, public address, and speech pathology.

This fall a graduate program leading to the degrees of Master of Arts and Master of Science in Education was initiated by the department of speech at Central Missouri State College.

At DePauw University the faculty has approved a program for Honors in Speech. Students with superior ability may be accepted into the program by the department at the end of the sophomore year. During the junior and senior years, they will do independent reading and research under the guidance of the faculty, take a comprehensive examination, and complete an independent project. Those who complete the program with distinction will be awarded honors in speech at graduation.

Greenville College is shifting this year from a required eight-semester-hour freshman communication course to a six-semester-hour English composition and a two-semester-hour basic speech requirement.

The drama department of Hofstra College is offering a master's degree in theatre this fall. The program stresses internship in teaching, directing, designing, and theatre operation.

The division of speech at Lehigh University is offering nine new one semester hour courses this year.

Long Beach State College announces that a graduate program leading to the M.A. degree in speech, drama, and speech correction has been approved by the California State Board of Education.

A master's program in speech and hearing was initiated at Los Angeles State College this summer.

St. Louis University is offering a master's degree in speech correction and an adult education program in the planning and management of community theatres.

A Master of Education in Communication is now being offered at South Dakota State College. The college faculty voted last spring to require every student to take four credits of oral communication as part of the core curriculum.

At Wisconsin State College, River Falls, a requirement of six quarter-hours in two areas of the fine arts—music, art, or theatre—has been set for all students. A special course in art of the theatre is being offered this year to meet the requirement.

Notes from the Clinics

Cornell University inaugurated a distinguished-lecturer series in speech pathology and audiology this spring. Lecturers were Moe Bergman, Hunter College; Jon Eisenson, Queens College; Claude Kantner, Ohio University; Jack Matthews, University of Pittsburgh; Robert Milisen, Indiana University; Albert Murphy, Boston University; Jane Beasley Raph, Rutgers University; and Robert West, Brooklyn College. Edmund C. Nuttall, who organized the series, announces that Lee Edward Travis will be the distinguished lecturer for 1961. He will give a series of lectures and seminars on the psychology of speech in April.

The speech clinic of Long Island University has expanded its community services to include a Saturday clinic for children ages five to twelve.

At a formal convocation of the School of Speech, Marquette University, in September, the speech therapy division formally occupied Duffey Hall, the Speech and Hearing Re-

habilitation Center. Participating in the convocation were the Very Reverend Edward J. O'Donnell, S.J., the President of Marquette; Stanley Ainsworth, President of the American Speech and Hearing Association; and Robert West, Brooklyn College. A conference "On Problems Confronting the Professor in Speech and Hearing" was also held with the directors of the various clinical programs in Wisconsin participating.

A new clinical center has been opened at San Diego State College. Facilities include ten sound-treated practice cubicles, each with recording equipment and one-way observation windows.

With Bryng Bryngelson's retirement (see Retirements) the department at Minnesota has reorganized its academic courses in speech pathology and audiology as a division and has named Ernest Henrikson as director. Mr. Henrikson continues as director of the speech and hearing clinic. Clark Starr has assumed responsibility for the undergraduate curriculum in pathology and audiology.

Minot State Teachers College, North Dakota, continued both its children's clinic and college clinic this summer. "We believe that Minot College is unique in maintaining speech and hearing clinic services for college students during the summer," our informant writes. Violette Ehart was in charge of the college clinic, and Hal Pufall of the clinics for teen-age stutterers and for children with cleft palate. Edna Gilbert, director of MSTC's clinic services, conducted a program for twenty children with delayed speech and articulatory problems.

The Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf, the oldest organization concerned with the education of the deaf in America, met at Northwestern University in April. The program was provided by the Department of Communicative Disorders and the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. The conference voted to certify the training for teachers of the deaf which is conducted by the Department of Communicative Disorders.

The 1959-60 Speech and Hearing Science Lecture Series at Ohio State University included Edith Corliss, National Bureau of Standards, "Measuring Distortion"; Dorothy Sherman, State University of Iowa, "Recent Research of Nasality"; and J. Milton Cowan, Cornell University, "Problems in Extracting Intonation Patterns of Speech."

A summer workshop for classroom teachers and school nurses was again conducted at Purdue University, under the direction of Betty Ann Wilson. The students studied speech and hearing problems and observed remedial work with one hundred children for three weeks.

Radio and Television

Ray H. Sandefur, head of the department of speech at the University of Akron, was named supervisor of educational television for a study under a Ford Foundation Grant. The new TV studios at Akron are to be ready for closed circuit programming by February, 1961.

Sara Lowry of Furman University will continue her program for the elementary schools, "How Do You Say It," this year.

Channel 4 (KTIV) Sioux City, Iowa, has made its facilities available for laboratory classes in television production to be conducted by Morningside College.

For approximately two months last spring, WBBM-TV of Chicago and Northwestern University presented "Rebuttal," a series of debates between college and university teams on propositions of current significance. The program was presented each Sunday afternoon before a panel of three critics and a studio audience and was video-taped for later performances. The following schools participated in the program: Northwestern, Ohio State University, Illinois State Normal University, Notre Dame University, Marquette University, University of Chicago, University of Illinois, Southern Illinois University, University of Southern California, King's College, Wayne State University, Augustana College, Dartmouth College, Kansas State Teachers College, United States Military Academy, George Washington University, and University of Kentucky. Frank D. Nelson, director of debate at Northwestern, was program advisor and coordinator.

Four films made by students of the department at the State University of Iowa have been accepted by the Amsterdam, Holland, Student Union for exhibition in *Cinestud 1960*, a student film festival. *Traditional Nigerian Art*, a television kinescope program, was produced by the Television Center under the direction of Orazio Fumagalli.

On June 18, Fort Worth station KFJZ-TV showed a video-tape of *The Legend of Madame Krasinska*, the spring production of the Texas Christian University Theatre.

Last spring semester, the Bureau of Speech Services of the University of Colorado sponsored

a television series, "Resolved," under the direction of Barbara Schindler, over KRMA, Denver. The half-hour programs featured intercollegiate and inter-high school debates of eighteen different resolutions. The programs were moderated by Thorrel B. Fest, Barbara Schindler, and Robley Rhine, and were judged by speech teachers from many areas of the state. The University of Colorado was recently the recipient of twenty-seven units of television equipment donated by station KBTV in Denver. That equipment plus an earlier gift of equipment from KOATV in Denver, is being used in closed circuit television operation under the direction of James Ward.

Morton Gordon of the University of Hawaii's speech department has completed two experimental classes in teaching speech improvement by television. The experiments were sponsored by the McInerny Foundation. The first, a televised, non-credit course in speech improvement for young adults, consisted of fifteen half-hour programs. Seven thousand copies of the text-manual were distributed upon request of the viewers. The second, a course in speech improvement for third grade children, involved two fifteen-minute telecasts and three fifteen-minute sessions led by the teachers in the classrooms. Two third graders appeared on each telecast. The experimental group of students made significantly greater gains in speech improvement than did the control group.

The University of Miami offered three television courses for credit this summer: English composition, logic, and the history of western civilization.

The radio-TV area of the speech department at the University of Michigan will be experimenting with new educational uses of a revolutionary type of closed circuit camera recently developed by the Argus Camera Division of Sylvania Electric Products. The new camera requires no auxiliary equipment but can be attached to any television receiver and operates at normal room light levels. It requires no engineering attention while in operation. Members of the department will use it in classes in television production and performance and will experiment with its potential use as a teaching aid in public address and oral interpretation classes.

Edward W. Borgers of the University of Southern California's department of telecommunications will be host for KUSC-FM's "International Inn," a program interviewing Los Angeles visitors from the Foreign Leaders Program of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the United States Department of State.

Reading Hours

Fourteen students and faculty members presented an experimental concert reading of Dylan Thomas' *Under Milk Wood* last spring at the College of St. Teresa, Winona, Minnesota. John Marzocco directed and participated in the reading.

At the University of Pittsburgh, the fifth season of the Poetry Group was directed by Ruth R. Haun of the speech department with the cooperation of members of the departments of English and modern languages. Participants in the monthly meetings read in French, German, and Czechoslovakian as well as in English. A number of Pittsburgh poets read from their works.

At the University of Arizona the Readers Theatre, under the direction of Gail Jaffe, presented a summer program "Meet the Readers." Selections included scenes from *Caesar and Cleopatra, Member of the Wedding,* and *The Madwoman of Chaillot.*

Mary Margaret Robb, University of Colorado, directs the Faculty Reading Hour sponsored by the speech department and the Union Memorial Center. The series includes weekly readings by faculty members in prose, poetry, and drama.

The University of Missouri held an Invitational College Oral Reading Festival in April. Contests in the reading of prose, poetry, and drama were participated in by students from five Missouri colleges. One of the highlights of the festival was the teachers' reading hour at the luncheon. Readers were: Thomas Fernandez, Westminster College; Donald Bird, Stephens College; Hazel Teabeau, Lincoln University; Frances McCurdy, University of Missouri; and Elizabeth Worrell, Northeast Missouri State Teachers College.

Programs for Business and Industry

The First Annual Conference on Business and Industrial Communications will be held on the University of Colorado campus October 21 and 22. Leaders will be Ralph Nichols in listening, Robert Morris in written communication, and Darrel Piersel in oral communication. The conference is being planned by an inter-disciplinary committee representing speech,

business administration, journalism, and continuation education.

Starting this fall, the department of public address and group communication at Northwestern University and the college co-operative and graduate training department of the Ford Motor Company will collaborate in offering a work-study program leading to the master of arts degree and probable employment in Ford's public communications and educational affairs department.

Herman Cohen of the department of speech was a summer staff member in the Management Development Program at the University of Oregon. He was responsible for two courses in communication. The students were fifty administrators of the United States Employment Service and the state employment services of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Alaska.

Gale Richards of the speech department was a member of the faculty of the summer session workshop for supervisory personnel of the Santa Fe Railroad held at the University of Southern California.

During the past year at the University of Georgia, Leighton M. Ballew and Arthur Fear have worked with nearly thirty conferences devoted to "Communications in Business and Industry." Most of these were one-week conferences scheduled at the Continuing Education Center on the university campus.

Donald O. Buell, 1907-1960

On June 8, 1960, the educational theatre lost one of its most colorful and enthusiastic promoters with the death of Donald O. Buell, Professor of Speech, Michigan State University. Death came from a coronary attack at the age of fifty-two.

Known as "Mr. Broadway" throughout the entire state, Don brought the Great White Way into the living rooms of the thousands of devotees with his weekly radio and television programs. Many people were introduced to theatre in this manner for the first time; even if they never visited New York they knew all about the weekly hits and flops as seen through the eyes of their most charming and gracious host.

Professor Buell was born in Janesville, Wisconsin, on June 22, 1907. He received a B.A. from Hamline University in 1930, and an M.F.A. from Yale University in 1933. He joined the staff at Michigan State University in 1937. Previously he had taught at the University of Nebraska. During his twenty-three years on campus, through his unflagging enthusiasm and constant work, students learned to love the theatre and share equally its rewards and defeats. His course in Contemporary Theatre was one of the most popular on campus. Reinforced by several visits to Broadway each year he would enter the classroom brimming with news and interest that never failed to stimulate his students.

Despite severe physical handicaps Don was tremendously active inside and outside the classroom. For many years he directed all plays presented by the department and promoted other campus activities extensively. His services were in constant demand as a speaker, a demand he could never satisfy. In 1958 he was a winner of an annual distinguished teacher award at Michigan State University, and characteristically he utilized his prize to begin a collection of Vandamm theatre art photographs. In the spring of 1960 the collection was accepted by the University Library as a permanent part of its service and will be known as the Don Buell-Vandamm Theatre Collection.

Nathaniel S. Eek
Michigan State University

Henry Lee Ewbank, Sr., Professor of Speech, University of Wisconsin, died August 13, 1960. Death came suddenly from an undiagnosed infection in the blood stream, at the age of sixty-seven. A memorial will be carried in the December issue.

Personals

John W. Bachman, Union Theological Seminary, has returned from a year's leave in England to study radio and TV productions of religious drama.

A. Craig Baird, professor emeritus, State University of Iowa, will teach at the University of Illinois the fall semester and at the University of Missouri the spring semester.

A grant from the Research Fund of the Graduate School of the University of Washington enables Barnet Baskerville to give his full time to research. He is gathering speeches for a second volume of American speeches which he is preparing with Ernest Wrage, Northwestern University.

Don Blakely, technical director of the Louisiana State University theatre, was a staff mem-

ber at the Tanglewood Theatre at Reynolds Memorial Park, Clemmons, North Carolina, this summer.

Clifford Blyton, University of Kentucky, has been elected chairman of the Humanities Division of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Paul Brandes, Ohio University, was the principal speaker at the convention of the Mississippi Speech Association in March. His address, "When Is A Speech?" was an effort to clarify the distinctive features of a public address.

The P. F. Collier and Son Corporation has announced the appointment of Arthur J. Bronstein, Queens College, as pronunciation consultant to the editorial staff planning a new edition of *Collier's Encyclopedia.*

Glenn Capp, Baylor University department chairman, visited schools of communication and speech departments at the University of Denver, University of Colorado, State University of Iowa, and Michigan State University. Baylor is considering establishing a school of communication.

H. P. Constans has resigned as chairman of the department at the University of Florida. He will continue to serve as professor of public address and advisor for graduate programs. Roy E. Tew has been appointed acting chairman of the department.

A Faculty and Alumni Commitee of Wayne State University selected Rupert L. Cortright to receive the 1960 Faculty Award. The award was presented at the Sixteenth Annual Honors Convocation of the University in May.

Eldon Elder, Brooklyn College, was one of thirty-two recipients of the recent awards by the Ford Foundation "to assist talented persons from several branches of the arts." His project is the designing of a 2,000 capacity theatre.

Working under a grant from the Purdue Research Foundation, Robert S. Goyer spent the summer studying "Individual Differences in the Ability and Achievement of College Students to Organize Ideas Verbally." With a similar grant, Ronald F. Reid continued his research, in Boston, toward a biography of Edward Everett.

During the summer, Earl R. Harlan, Purdue, acted as narrator for the outdoor historical drama "Unto These Hills" at Cherokee, North Carolina.

Marie Hochmuth, on leave from the University of Illinois, and Alan Nichols, University of Southern California, were married on August 18, Fayetteville, Arkansas, at the home of Mr. Nichols' brother, Guerdon D. Nichols, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, University of Arkansas. Mr. and Mrs. Nichols are living at 3635 South Genesee Avenue, Los Angeles 16, California.

A special scholarship grant enabled Milton Howarth, Long Beach State College, to spend the summer at Bayreuth, Germany, in the Wagnerian master classes in design.

Esther M. Jackson, Tuskegee Institute, has been appointed a Fulbright Scholar. She will spend the year in London engaged in research in Shakespearean drama in the Victoria and Albert Museum.

A University of Delaware Research Fellowship enabled C. Robert Kase to spend the summer studying the performance of comedy. He tape recorded comedies performed at various summer theatres in order to analyze audience reactions.

Under a grant from the Carnegie Corporation and the auspices of the New England Board of Higher Education, Mary Kinnane, Boston College, has been conducting a research study of the attitudes of New England undergraduates toward college teaching as a profession. The study, which involves over 3400 students at forty-five New England colleges and universities, will be published this fall.

Dominic LaRusso, University of Washington, spent the summer in Europe, chiefly in Italy, doing research on mediaeval rhetoric.

An Oberlin College Summer Grant was made to Jerome B. Landfield to allow him to study the speaking of Richard Brinsley Sheridan and Samuel Johnson. He spent four weeks at Harvard, Yale, New York City, and Washington, D. C., on his project.

Glenn Loney, Hofstra College, spent the summer in Europe writing for the *Christian Science Monitor.* Late in August, he took a group of college students into Russia.

In September Roy Mahaffey, head of the speech department at Linfield College, received an honorary doctor's degree from the college. He is in his thirty-third year on Linfield's faculty.

Mitchell Maloof, formerly of Staly College, has been appointed speech pathologist at the North Adams Hospital, North Adams, Massachusetts, and consultant to the North Adams School Department.

The Interstate Oratorical Association has

named Frank Nelson, director of Forensics at Northwestern University, as its secretary.

Lynn R. Osborn, assistant to the chairman of the University of Kansas speech department, has received a Danforth Foundation Teacher Study Grant which he will use to work on his Ph.D. in education at the University of Kansas.

Last April Edward M. Penson, Ohio University, was guest lecturer at West Virginia Wesleyan College. He spoke before the students and faculty of the departments of speech psychology, sociology, and education on "Recent Theories of Stuttering Causation and Therapy."

Betty Jane McWilliams, University of Pittsburgh, was elected secretary-treasurer of the American Association of Cleft Palate Rehabilitation.

Mary Margaret Robb directed the University of Colorado Writers Conference from July 25 to August 2. Miss Robb has been associated with the conference, the second oldest of its type in the United States, since 1950.

William M. Sattler, who has been the acting chairman, has been appointed chairman of the department of speech at the University of Michigan.

Harrold Shiffler, Hastings College, Nebraska, directed the opera *Carmen* as a part of the Twenty-second Annual Fine Arts Festival at the State University of Iowa.

Edward Stasheff, University of Michigan, participated in the National Seminar sponsored by the Television, Radio and Film Commission of the Methodist Church in Nashville.

William S. Tacey, University of Pittsburgh, president of the newly organized Council of State and Regional Conferences, American Association of University Professors, was reappointed a member of Committee F, Membership and Dues, AAUP. John Ulrich was the narrator of WQED's two hour telecast of the University of Pittsburgh's June Commencement.

As first vice-president of the Texas Federation of Republican Women's Clubs, Lola Walker, Baylor, attended the Republican state convention last June.

Todd G. Willy, State University of Iowa, spent the summer searching and photographing materials at the British Museum for his dissertation on the debate over "Chinese" Gordon and the Egyptian crisis of 1884-1885.

ARTICLES WANTED. But not just any article: the editor of *Today's Speech* says he "needs more expertly written articles on various phases of speech. We aim, both in content and style, for pieces that will appeal to laymen." Send your contributions to William S. Tacey, Department of Speech, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania.

TAPE DISCUSSION CONTEST. Wayne N. Thompson, originator of the National Discussion Contest ten years ago, announces that he is turning over the sponsorship of the affair to his colleague, Jack Armold. Colleges interested in submitting twenty-five minute taped discussions on the national intercollegiate question should write for information to Mr. Armold, University of Illinois Undergraduate Division, Navy Pier, Chicago 11. Entries must be declared by November 15 and tapes mailed by December 1.

INTEREST GROUPS. ST has amassed a fat file of newsletters from the many interest groups of SAA. He heartily recommends that readers in search of bibliographies, materials, and fresh ideas choose their interests and write to the secretaries of the appropriate groups. You may have to persist since secretaries are busy people and even move about (e.g., Frank E. X. Dance, secretary, Business and Professional Speaking interest group, has moved to the University of Kansas), but keep at it. For a list of groups and officers, see Shop Talk for February 1960, or *1960 Directory*.

Readers with an interest in British Public Address will find no interest group listed for them. However, at the 1959 convention the interest group in Rhetoric and Public Address accepted the Committee on British Public Address as a standing committee. This committee has issued the first number of its newsletter *Panl* (March 1960), under the editorship of Donald C. Bryant, State University of Iowa. Those wishing to receive the newsletter should write to Robert W. Smith, Department of Speech and Drama, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, secretary of the committee.

COINCIDENCE. ST wishes to note two incidents which occurred last spring. First, he saw one of the series of advertisements sponsored by the Container Corporation of America. This particular example of modern art was accompanied by a quotation from *The Education of Henry Adams:* "A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops." Shortly thereafter he received this letter from Lionel Crocker: "We have had on our campus at